

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

CLARENCE TRUE WILSON

5





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

TEMPERANCE SERMONS.

THE CYCLOPEDIA OF TEMPERANCE, PROHIBITION, AND PUBLIC MORALS (Coeditor with Deets Pickett).

The Divine Right of Democracy

OR

The People's Right to Rule

A STUDY IN CITIZENSHIP

BY

CLARENCE TRUE WILSON



THE ABINGDON PRESS

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

Copyright, 1922, by
CLARENCE TRUE WILSON

Printed in the United States of America

The Bible text used in this volume is taken from the American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible, copyright, 1901, by Thomas Nelson & Sons, and is used by permission.

DEDICATION:
TO MY WIFE,
INSPIRER OF MY PLANS AND
COMPANION OF MY TOILS,
WHO HAS HELPED ME TO LIVE
WHAT I HEREIN TEACH—
DEMOCRACY

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. THE FORGOTTEN SOURCE OF OUR FEDERAL CONSTITUTION.....	9
II. BUILDING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY INTO GOVERNMENT.....	31
III. JESUS CHRIST, THE EMBODIMENT OF DEMOCRATIC IDEALS	46
IV. IS THE UNITED STATES A CHRISTIAN NATION?.....	63
V. PAGAN INROADS ON AMERICAN DEMOCRACY.....	82
VI. THE FUNCTION OF LAW IN CIVIL GOVERNMENT.....	99
VII. THE LATEST EVOLUTION OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY.....	118
BIBLIOGRAPHY	141

I

THE FORGOTTEN SOURCE OF OUR FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

FOR twenty-five years I have been reading law books. They include the works of the greatest lawyers who have ever written on their chosen branches of learning, such as Cooley, on the *Principles of the Constitution: Constitutional Limitations*; Bishop on "Contract Law," "Non-Contract Law," "Criminal Law," "Marriage and Divorce"; and more recently the great works on the Constitution and its origin by Hannis Taylor; by C. E. Stevens, on the *Sources of the Constitution of the United States*; and William M. Meigs, on *The Growth of the Constitution*. It is amazing that in their search for sources, their study of origins, it never seemed to dawn upon one of them that they should look to the one Book that was familiar to all the makers of the Constitution. The Bible was the book from which in childhood they were taught to spell, the book from which they took their first reading lesson, which became the law book of the colonies and the classic in the home, the book that

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

was consulted by lawyers for precedents, by judges for decisions, by orators for eloquence, by literary men for style, by historians for facts, by lawmakers for models.

In thirty works that I have read on the Constitution of the United States not an intimation has appeared that our fathers in the formation of our government drew upon their knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures, of the Law of Moses, or of the teachings of Christ. It might be expected that the sacred books of one's religion would at least so color his thoughts that, if not consciously, then unconsciously, he would be influenced in his experiments of making a new government.

Some writers have traced the American Constitution to the instincts of the Anglo-Saxon; some to the experiments of the New England town meeting; some to the experience in the struggles of thirteen colonies with environments, mother governments, and aborigines, the internal disturbances in their individual struggles toward unity and attempted harmony with their fellow colonists; and they account for our Constitution as the sum total of these worked-out results.

Other writers are emphatic and elaborate in their conclusions and proof that the written Constitution of the United States is purely

THE FORGOTTEN SOURCE

the outgrowth of the English unwritten Constitution, but Campbell has written a great work of two massive volumes on *The Puritan in Holland, England, and America* to show that the essential principles of our Constitution were borrowed from Holland during the short stay of our New England ancestors there, and that these principles came over in the Mayflower and were transplanted in America from Holland.

Hannis Taylor goes back through all these influences and a hundred more and finds the germs of our republican form of government in the so-called republics of Greece and Rome, republics that were not, in our sense, republics at all, but experiments in self-government by the aristocracy; for not one sixth of the men of voting age ever had the right to the ballot; the slaves, the serfs, the women, were excluded and others who might be in disfavor. Our fathers knew one thousand times more about Moses than they did about Plato, or Aristotle, or Solon, or Lycurgus. They were saturated with the teaching, the principles of the laws of Moses, and the writings of the prophets and apostles. Never in one sentence does this most learned author intimate that they might have been influenced by these scriptural authorities rather than by the rare learning of the few

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

who had a familiarity with the classic writers.

Almost every standard work on the origin of the Constitution and government of the United States learnedly traces the development of all the germs of democracy in Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Greece, and Rome, through our Anglo-Saxon ancestors into the English common law, and then from the common law to our federal Constitution. But, if they are Roman Catholic in their training, they laboriously belittle the influence of the English common law in favor of the Roman civil law, and attribute all the growth of the equity idea in our courts to Rome, in order to lay the foundation for a claim that the United States Constitution and federal enactments owe more to the Roman civilization than to the British.

I am thoroughly convinced that both of these claims are in error. After many years of reading the great authors in jurisprudence I am impressed that their desire to keep church and state absolutely separate has led them afield, even to the extreme denial or to utterly ignoring the influence of religion in the formation of our Union. It must not be overlooked that our fathers, when they sat down to form the Constitution, had very little knowledge of Greek or Roman law; none of Assyrian, Baby-

THE FORGOTTEN SOURCE

Ionian, or Egyptian. There was only one Book that every man in that convention knew from cover to cover, that they had been raised with from earliest childhood, and derived their earliest and latest impressions from, and that volume was the Hebrew Bible or Christian Scriptures. From this book came their first ideals of human equality, of universal brotherhood, of racial relationship, of the inherent capability of mankind for self-government. They learned these principles of nature from the texts, and got their object lessons from a whole race experimenting on these methods of government.

All the religious convulsions that shook Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had to have an outlet, and men naturally turned to America. Her newly planted colonies invited the oppressed, the agitated, and the determined to come to this land and on this free soil form a nation of religious toleration, where men could think and let think and respect each other's rights to differ. This new soil and new outlook furnished the theater for the action of these agitating forces, where the votaries of independent religious beliefs could worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. Every one of the eighteen languages used in the religious

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

controversies of Europe was spoken in our American settlements, and each agitation was represented here. A distinctly religious basis was furnished for every one of the thirteen colonies that formed our Union, for their citizens had come here to worship God according to the freedom of their own convictions. They believed in the individual responsibility of the free will. They had few books, but they each owned a Bible. They taught their children letters, spelling, and reading, from its sacred pages. They learned ethics and etiquette, law and government, as well as theology, by its profound study. It was a treasury from which they drew the very words that they remembered as a classic, and to find men in several of the colonies who knew their Bibles from cover to cover was not difficult.

Is it any wonder that they formed the freest, most moral, and most prosperous Christian nation of the world? They did not write the name of God in the Constitution, nor organize a state church, but a failure to mention the name of Deity is no proof of disbelief in him. The book of Esther is one of the most beautiful studies in Divine Providence, but it nowhere mentions the name of God. Thousands of resolutions are passed every year in preachers' meetings, Conferences, and Synods, that do

THE FORGOTTEN SOURCE

not mention the name of the Deity. Our fathers, coming from the Old World, where they had been oppressed by state churches through enforced religious conformity, wisely determined to follow Christ's statements, "My kingdom is not of this world," "The kingdom of heaven is within you," and Paul's declaration, "The kingdom of God is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit." Knowing, therefore, that the Kingdom is spiritual and cometh not with observation, they took all trammels off religion, gave it a free field, protected its votaries in worship, and granted religious toleration to all. Believing that Christ's kingdom can stand alone, they gave it free access to all hearts, homes, schools, courts, legislatures, and enthroned it in the sentiments of men. Washington took his oath of office with the Bible in his hand. When a witness steps upon the stand, when a judge promises to mete out justice, when an executive promises to enforce our laws, it is upon that Book, whose teachings have made us, and calling upon that God whose we are and whom we serve, that the affirmation is made. The weekly observance of the Lord's Day, the celebration of all the days of Christ—as Easter and Christmas—the annual observance of Thanksgiving and prayer in times of national

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

distress, the sentiment on every dollar with which we pay our debts, "In God We Trust," proclaim with the supreme court of the land that "this is a Christian nation."

But above all of these, when our fathers met in Philadelphia to form the federal government they copied every principle and modeled every plan from that ancient government, when God alone was King and Moses wrote his law in deathless enactments, constitutional and statutory, for ancient Israel. The analogy between that divine model and our American Constitution is worthy of a patriotic attention which it has never had.

Clement wrote in distinct terms that Plato got the idea of his republic from Moses and then showed the correspondence between the two. In both, God was King, virtue was the chief requirement, and men were to be brothers. Now, we know that the government of Moses was the first of its kind ever founded on earth. In every other known to history, the king's or ruler's mind was the supreme law, and life, death, and property were in his hands alone. In Egypt, where Moses was born, monarchy was supreme, and there was nothing in his surroundings to suggest a pure democracy or republican forms. Yet for four hundred and seventy years, or longer than the time

THE FORGOTTEN SOURCE

from our day to the date when Columbus discovered America, Israel had no king, and when they rebelled and insisted on the establishment of a monarchy they were told it would be their national destruction, and that their acceptance of an earthly king was a rejection of God as their King.

“And Jehovah said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee; for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not be king over them” (1 Sam. 8. 7). “Now therefore hearken unto their voice: howbeit thou shalt protest solemnly unto them, and shalt show them the manner of the king that shall reign over them. And Samuel told all the words of Jehovah unto the people that asked of him a king. And he said, This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: he will take your sons, and appoint them unto him, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and they shall run before his chariots; and he will appoint them unto him for captains of thousands, and captains of fifties; and he will set some to plow his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and the instruments of his chariots. And he will take your daughters to be perfumers, and to be cooks, and to be bakers.

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants; . . . and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king whom ye shall have chosen you; and Jehovah will not answer you in that day. But the people refused to hearken unto the voice of Samuel; and they said, Nay; but we will have a king over us, that we also may be like all the nations, and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles." Was there ever a prophecy of a future curse more thoroughly fulfilled in our world's history?

It was said of a certain king that he made of the nation a solitude and called that "Peace"; and our patriarch, Job, always reverent toward God, was bitter toward kings when he said, "The kings of the world build solitudes," or, as the American Revised Version translates it,

"With kings and counselors of the earth,
Who built up waste places for themselves."
(Job 3. 14.)

This is both a historic and a philosophic statement, for the rule of kings is the rule of ruin. God made man for self-government. The lordship of kings has never been by di-

THE FORGOTTEN SOURCE

vine right, but by human usurpation. When God governed Israel for four hundred and seventy years "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes," enjoyed liberty under law and maintained a primitive democracy. These rulers of ancient Israel were called "judges"; and it was not because God favored kings that he permitted Samuel to give Israel a king, but because he respected the rights of free-will and human choice and believed it was better that humanity should be self-governed though governed wrongly than to be forced into obedience to the divine law if it left the human mind a mere automaton. So he told Samuel to let them have their way and the kings of Israel, like the kings of all the earth, "built solitudes."

They wasted the substance of the people; they took away their personality and their freedom; they oppressed them with taxes and burdens too heavy to be borne, burdens which no one of them would have touched with his little finger; they reversed the divine order of things and instead of serving the people, the people have been their subjects; they ruled, not for the good of the many, but to build up family lines, immense wealth, classes of flatterers and intriguing satellites; they flaunted unearned gains before the covetous eyes of man

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

while the race has eaten dust and bowed before the scepter of tyranny. Glutted with the blood of the oppressed, they sought other worlds to conquer and became ambitious to be known as "world rulers" and not as the servants of the people who supported them.

If one were asked to name the two most colossal blunders in government, the greatest heresies of the human mind, the errors that have caused more misery than any two that ever found lodgment in the human race, what would they be? I should say that the first is that there could be such a thing as a royal family or any fictitious line of demarkation between a ruler and his people that separates the masses from the classes, the plebeians from the Roman patricians, the barbarians from the Greeks. When God made man capable of self-government, endowing him with the tremendous prerogative of freedom, enabling him to select his own rulers, he put in him an in-born discontent with anything like oppression or any assumption of authority over him. Our Master protested against this when he taught: "The lords of the Gentiles exercise dominion, but it shall not be so among you," and the Declaration of Independence declares that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"; and under any

THE FORGOTTEN SOURCE

form of government where there is an assumption of right to rule without the consent of the governed, "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God."

Rulership by hereditary right implies that you can tell the character and capability of a man by the line of his ancestors—a fool's conception, for, if anyone thinks it true, let him tell me why Adam should beget a Cain; David an Absalom, or anybody a Judas? We in America would not select a son even of Lincoln for an elective office on the basis of his father's merit. Where are Shakespeare's sons, or Milton's, or Sir Isaac Newton's? Would it not be as sensible to scrape up some descendant of theirs and arbitrarily make him our poet or scientist, as to select a ruler by inheritance? No man was ever made good enough to govern a community without that community's consent.

Democracy may make its mistakes, and republican forms of government may disappoint their advocates in many respects, but misgovernment by the people is infinitely better than misgovernment by hereditary rulers, for the people have a right to do what they will with their own. If they make mistakes, they can correct them, and it is their business whether things are right or wrong. Our government

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

is founded on one fundamental principle—the innate capability of man for self-government. This is in harmony with the divine intent when the Creator said, “Let us make man in our image, . . . and let them have dominion.” When humanity works out this ideal into forms of government, man must select his rulers by virtue of their merit through direct choice of the governed. But monarchy is built on selected families and inherited prerogatives—as fundamental an error as was ever devised by human folly.

The second governmental heresy is the law of primogeniture, which implies that the eldest son of the royal family is born with the ruler’s prerogative. This universal misstep which gives an eldest son a ruler’s place by birthright has ignored merit and deprived government of genius. Many times in real life we have known the oldest son to be far surpassed intellectually and morally by the seventh, ninth, or thirteenth boy. John Wesley was the sixteenth, and his poet brother, Charles, was born later still.

The American idea of selecting rulers by merit and not by birthright is from the Scriptures. In contradistinction from every other nation known to history, the Hebrew Bible ignores the universal custom and blazes a trail

THE FORGOTTEN SOURCE

to independence. For from Abel to David, a period of three thousand years, in not a single instance where God chose the ruler, or the progenitor of a race, or the ancestor of a Messiah, did he choose the eldest son. Our fathers studied their Bible and established a government whose rulers were chosen by suffrage. Where did they get the idea that there was nothing in primogeniture? Why, their favorite Book showed that Cain was the first born, but Abel was chosen and his older brother rejected. Shem, the younger, was preferred to Japheth. Isaac was chosen and not his older brother, Ishmael. Esau and Jacob were twins, but before the birth God told their mother, "Two people shall be born of thee, and the one people shall be stronger than the other people and the older shall serve the younger"; and Jacob was chosen instead of Esau. In Jacob's family there were twelve sons, and God passed by the three elder and chose Judah, the fourth son, to be the progenitor of Christ and to establish Judaism; he passed by ten brothers and advanced Joseph to be the ruler, thus making the eleventh son the preferred of the family. Then Ephraim, the youngest son of Joseph, was preferred before Manasseh.

When Joseph brought his two sons to his aged and blind father to receive the blessing,

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

he took Manasseh, the elder, to his father's right hand to receive his chief blessing, but the patriarch, crossing his hands wittingly, put his right hand on the head of the younger to confer the chief blessing, but Joseph, thinking his father was making a mistake, objected, and tried to remove his father's right hand to the oldest son, when the patriarch said, "I know it, my son, but his younger brother is the greater." Moses, the younger, was made leader, not Aaron. When Saul was deposed and the prophet Samuel was sent to the house of Jesse to anoint the king, in accordance with human custom he arose to anoint Eliab, the oldest, but he was told to stop, and informed that "man looketh on the outward appearance and God looketh on the heart." Six sons were successively brought in and refused, but David, the seventh and youngest, was chosen. From this it is easy to see what influenced the framers of our Constitution to make our form of government, especially when we consider that ours was the first government that was ever formed by Bible-reading men.

Where did our fathers get the notion that they could found a government on the very reverse of this universal custom of selecting rulers by heredity and birthright? There was one exception in ancient times—the Hebrew

THE FORGOTTEN SOURCE

people—and only one book—the Bible—that taught that rulers should be selected by merit and not by birthright. If perfect resemblance is an evidence of identity, the histories of the Hebrew and the American Constitutions are identical, as the two instruments form a perfect parallel.

Both countries were under a foreign ruler and both resulted from a marked deliverance from oppression.

Both set up monumental testimony to perpetuate that deliverance in the observance of a national holiday, or holy day, one in the institution of the Passover, the other in the observance of the 4th of July as Independence Day.

Both observed their national holiday sacredly.

The Hebrews had twelve tribes or states, for Joseph was divided between Ephraim and Manasseh, all merged in one general government. We had thirteen colonies formed into a more perfect Union.

From these twelve tribes seventy representatives were chosen, constituting the supreme tribunal (Exod. 18. 17–27), and the right of appeal was recognized from all lesser judges up to this supreme court; and our country has followed them in making the judges of our courts supreme, giving them final authority

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

over even the President and both houses of Congress.

For four hundred and seventy years they had no king, and when they rebelled and insisted on a king they were warned that it would be their national destruction. All this period they were ruled by judges, men divinely endowed and then selected by the people; and our own land is the only one since that day that has been ruled by judges; we put our supreme court ahead of the President, Cabinet, Senate, Congress, army, or navy.

The constitution of Israel and our own are the only two ever submitted to a people for ratification. They voted on and adopted theirs at the fords of the Jordan. We composed and submitted ours at the banks of the Delaware.

They are the only two constitutions that ever made provision for the naturalization of foreigners. Strangers could become as home-born by swearing away their allegiance to foreign potentates and strange gods, and yielding obedience to the God of the Hebrews. They were known as reborn or "naturalized"; and it was with reference to this process conducted by the elders that our Lord said to Nicodemus, "Art thou a ruler in Israel, and knowest not these things?"

While making ample provision for inducting

THE FORGOTTEN SOURCE

a foreigner into citizenship, these constitutions were the only two that forever prohibited a foreigner from holding the chief executive office. "Thou mayest not put a foreigner over thee, who is not thy brother," meaning one of the children of Israel (Deut. 17. 15), and our fathers, beginning with the first, ended with the last of these provisions, which forever bars a foreign-born citizen from being President of the United States.

In all these essential features we see the several great principles of the Jewish government transferred to our own as clearly as we can see every lineament of our mother's face transferred by the artist's skill to the photo.

The Old-Testament Scriptures gave our fathers the political ideals that they formulated into our Constitution. The Hebraic commonwealth forbade all caste and class distinctions, and America is founded on equality before the law.

It required that all people should be equal, and provided against any ecclesiastical aristocracy by making the priesthood dependent for their subsistence upon the voluntary contributions of the people, and we follow them in our absolute separation of church from state support.

They surrounded their monarchy with care-

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

fully framed constitutional safeguards, most of which we copied into our government.

They organized the government into three departments—legislative, executive, and judicial. Our fathers made this idea the corner stone of the republic.

They provided two representative assemblies corresponding to our House of Representatives and our Senate.

They made provision simple but not ineffective both for public charity and for public education. Our charity and school systems, taken from them in germ, have been the wonder of the modern world.

They surrounded two known evils, slavery and polygamy, with such restrictions that both had disappeared from among the Jewish people before the time of Christ, and our government has been the freest forum for reforms known to man.

Their lawbook has warned against intoxicants and taught the principles of total abstinence and prohibition, and that old Hebrew planting has just come to fruition in our own land through the Eighteenth Amendment.

Where shall we find a simpler and more compact statement of the spirit which should animate and the principles which should control organized society than will be found in the Ten

THE FORGOTTEN SOURCE

Commandments: reverence for God, respect for the Sabbath, the seventh portion of our time systematically saved from drudgery for rest and spiritual development, and regard for the four fundamental rights of man—the rights of person, of property, of family, and of reputation?

These facts and parallels remind us afresh that our fathers were the first group of Bible-reading men who ever sat down to devise a new form of government, and it is easy when you consider the history of the Pilgrim Fathers and the religious antecedents of the other settlers of the New World to understand the part the Bible must have played in the development of our government and in guiding our fathers in the avoidance of the two colossal blunders of all of the nations, enabling them to steer safely between these rocks into the haven of democracy.

Shall this Book, read at the making and signing of the Declaration of Independence, and whose underlying principles were copied into the Constitution of the government; the Book that Washington kissed when inaugurated President, and on which all our rulers have taken their oath of office and all witnesses and juries have sworn to be true and just—shall this Book be excluded from our

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

public schools to gratify foreigners or even home-born citizens who owe supreme allegiance to a foreign potentate? Never! Not in the name of a sect or even in the interest of religion, but in the cause of patriotism, consistency, and common honesty we demand that the Book that made us shall not now be placed under the ban.

II

BUILDING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY INTO GOVERNMENT

ARISTOTLE said that "Solon bestowed upon the people as much power as was indispensable—the power to elect their own magistrates and to hold them to accountability. If the people have less than this they will not remain tranquil; they will be in slavery and become hostile to the constitution." Surely, the American people are entitled to and are capable of using as much power as the Athenians of twenty-five hundred years ago. They could elect and remove magistrates at will. This is democracy.

The supremacy of the people is the foundation of this government. This principle is engraved on all our hearts by the pen of Jefferson, the speech of Henry, and the sword of Washington. It is inscribed on the soul of man by a greater artist, by God Almighty, who said: "Let us make man in our image; . . . and let them have dominion."

The Creator, therefore, endowed man with the tremendous prerogative of freedom and

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

meant that he should govern himself, and the greatest battle waged since then has been between the utterly antagonistic forces of those who would rule men and those who contend for the right of man to rule himself. First, the cause was defeated by a petty tyrant assuming to himself the rôle of dictator and lording it over God's sons and daughters with the motto, "Might makes right." Then the God-like spirit reasserted itself and threw off the yoke, and human freedom got another chance.

Another stage was reached when the race adopted hereditary monarchs. Passing by merit in selecting rulers and hinging all on birthright, it ignored the real sovereign, the *people*, and inaugurated some degenerate who represented the rotten remnant of a long line of petted and pampered aristocracy. With the fiction of the divine right of kings it held down the people from their inalienable rights and quoted, "The king's mind is the only law."

But our fathers, studying their Bibles and feeling the common instincts of human nature, turned away from all this subterfuge and determined to found a nation on the fitness of mankind for self-government. They interpreted this principle in these words: "All men are created equal. They are endowed by their

BUILDING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Creator with certain inalienable rights. To secure these, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to abolish it," and "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God."

They instituted this new government in such form as to them seemed likely to effect their safety and happiness. Listen to them again: "Appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, we do in the name and by the authority of the good people of these colonies solemnly publish and declare that these United States are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States." When a Constitution was to be formed for them, who did it? "We, the people of the United States, in order to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish."

God is a democrat. As Supreme Ruler, King of kings, and Lord of lords, he said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over . . . all the earth." Thus he endowed humanity with the tremendous prerogative of freedom, the power of choice, the right to rule and the inherent

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

ability for self-government. When he planned our guidance, it was not as automatons but as freemen, not by arbitrary rules but by appeal to the sovereign will, through intellect and emotions. It was a spiritual mission to which he called Abraham. Civilization started in a garden but it culminates in the cities. It is an evolution. After this call to the spirit had developed through the patriarchal period, there followed the five hundred years of primitive democracy under the judges. But Israel wanted something more tangible than an invisible king. This desire for a visible embodiment of authority has been the limitation of democracy and the curse of religion. "Make us a king, that we may be like the nations," they said to Samuel. "Let us have priests to pray for us, and altars and images to embody religious thoughts for us, and a hierarchy to do our thinking for us," say the dupes of religious superstition and dependency to ecclesiastics who lord it over mankind. During the periods of Ezra and Nehemiah legalism came into the State. Priests gained ascendancy over the prophets and mastered the mind of Judaism until it could not understand John the Baptist or appreciate the spiritual teaching of Jesus.

The study of that five hundred years of his-

BUILDING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

tory in a primitive democracy with a republican form of government, will show that God alone was King, that he never shared the prerogative with a human being, that the Hebrews were called to demonstrate two things before the whole world: monotheism, and that to set up a king was to reject Jehovah from reigning over them. For he had just as truly called them to teach the nations democracy as he had called them to reveal an ethical theocracy to the world. Their national mission, therefore, was to demonstrate that there was nothing in that hollow pretense from the realm of evil, "the divine right of kings," but that the divine right of government inheres in the people.

During a period of four hundred and seventy years, or longer than the time since Columbus discovered America, there was no king in Israel. How remarkable it was for Israel to be democratic amid universal, oriental, despotic monarchy! They were as distinctly called by the voice of God and by Divine Providence to carry democracy to the world as they were to teach an ethical monotheism to the nations. And what fools they were after a successful experiment of many generations to wish to have a king and be "like all the nations" of the earth (1 Sam. 8. 4, 5).

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

If Israel had been loyal to her high mission of developing democracy and working out the experiment of government under republican forms, it would have revolutionized the history of the world; and the ages would not have had to wait three thousand years for this divinely inspired ideal to be worked out by forty-eight sovereign States under the federal Constitution of the United States.

The mental gymnastics, the acrobatic performances of the authors who try to find the model of American democracy in Greece and Rome would be pitiful if it were not for the element of humor. Greece and Rome were not democracies in our sense. In their struggles toward self-government they never conceived the idea of more than one sixth of the people having any vote or any voice. There is only one model of a pure democracy where human liberty was for all, where there were no serfs, no aristocracies, no ruling classes and no disfranchised citizens, where a republican form of government was adopted with constitutional provisions and statutory enactments and submitted to the people for ratification. The laws of God are the foundation of our common law, acknowledged so by Blackstone and other eminent lawyers.

With the exception of the first two com-

BUILDING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

mandments, which are excluded because of our Constitutional clause favoring religious freedom, we find the following parallels between the divinely given Ten Commandments and the laws of the modern democracies:

“Thou shalt not take the name of Jehovah thy God in vain”—Profanity in public is a misdemeanor punishable by fine or imprisonment or both.

“Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy”—At the present time there is a strong movement throughout the length and breadth of the land for a “Sabbath Rest” law. A law that will preserve the true Sabbath intent.

“Honor thy father and thy mother”—Public institutions are maintained wherein incorrigible children may be placed by their parents for reformation.

“Thou shalt not kill”—Murder is a crime punishable by death or life imprisonment.

“Thou shalt not commit adultery”—Adultery is a crime punishable by fine or imprisonment or both, and is one of the few universally recognized pleas for divorce.

“Thou shalt not steal”—Theft is a crime punishable by fine or imprisonment or both.

“Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor”—An attempt to blacken and ruin the reputation or good name of another

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

by false representation is an acknowledged cause of action. Also, perjury is a crime punishable by fine or imprisonment or both.

“Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor’s”—All of these are crimes punishable by fine or imprisonment or both, and are acknowledged causes of civil action for damages.

It may surprise the average Christian reader to know that Thomas Paine, who was one of the most dashing characters and virile writers in our pre-Revolution period, in a volume entitled *Common Sense*, gathers up these lessons from a study of the Hebrew Bible and most effectively tells the story that Gideon, one of the judges, after his marvelous success in a battle with the Midianites, was offered the kingship of the Hebrew race. They besought him that he and his son and his son’s son might reign over them. But Gideon, imbued with the divine principle of the inherent right of man to be his own sovereign under the sole sovereignty of God, declined the offer for himself and his sons, saying, “I will not reign over you, and my sons shall not reign over you, but God shall reign over you.”

Some of our fathers loved to tell how this

BUILDING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Bible story, so effectively told by Paine in his *Common Sense*, was a favorite narrative of George Washington, Father of his Country. After the Revolution and the utter failure of the Articles of Confederation to hold the States together so that they could function as a nation, when many of the leading spirits of the country determined that this land should have a head, and offered George Washington the position of king, Washington quoted this same precedent from the ancient Hebrew story as a reason why he could not think of such a thing as being a party to the breakdown of this democracy under a republican form, or to the establishment of the royal prerogative on this sacred soil of freedom.

Those who are fond of tracing these historic relationships will be greatly interested in another precedent that Washington had before him, from the same book. There was One whose matchless teaching and miracles of power and mercy so won the hearts of the people that they came in multitudes to him beseeching him to reign over them, and upon his refusal came and met him as he entered into the gates of the city, spreading palm branches at the feet of the beast he rode, crying, "Hail, Master, King of the Jews," and sought by force to make him a king. But he

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

turned from the trappings and ideals of royalty and assured them that "his kingdom was not of this world," that the kingdom of God was a kingdom above all other principalities, that it was spiritual in its nature, and that he would not merge it with any secular government. If his vicegerents had always followed this precedent, some of the darkest and bloodiest deeds of human history would never have been perpetrated.

An interesting side light upon the origin of our government is seen in the attitude of certain churches toward republican forms of democracy. The ideal of Jesus is still inadequately realized in certain types of Christianity. Democracy and republican forms have had rough sledding wherever the dominating religion has been Roman Catholic, and have had their only free and successful opportunities of growth where the soil has been prepared by a democratic church, teaching the simple Bible ideals of government for church and state.

Why did the French Revolution, that started out with the words "Liberty, equality, fraternity," wind up with infantry, cavalry, and artillery? How starting with democracy did it find issue in a practical despotism? How account for a land, thoroughly united in a

BUILDING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

patriotic desire to establish a republic in the heart of Europe, going back to absolute monarchy and making a sorry spectacle of democracy before the whole world, while the American colonies, oppressed from without and divided within, formed the greatest self-governing nation in the annals of time? The most satisfactory explanation is that America made her experiment under the influence of a free church, free schools, open Bibles, colonial independence, the Puritan Sabbath, and Christian home life. But, on the other hand, France, with as many patriots, had to work out her experiment with her common people untaught by Bible reading at the fireside, her masses of men untrained in the free schools, which are the prerequisite to successful republican forms, and her leaders thwarted by the intrigues of a priesthood, dominated and saturated with oligarchical systems and monarchical ideals. If France makes a success of a republic, she must do it with the *opposition* of the dominant religion. America has made a success of her experiment because she has had the stimulus of a democratic church, governed by republican forms and surrounded by a Bible-reading people.

A more interesting side light still is to recall that of the eighteen languages that were

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

used in the religious controversies that shook Europe three or four centuries ago all were represented in the American colonies. Every religious agitation sent representatives of its best blood here to find a free field for the exercise of its faith. Of our thirteen colonies that formed the Union every one had a religious basis. But one finds in a careful and comparative study of the varied influence and attitude of the several state churches this interesting thing—that the more democratic the church, the more thoroughly it was identified with our Revolution and with our new government; and the more nearly it veered off into monarchical forms of government, the more it opposed the new movement for breaking loose from King George and the British crown. The descendants of the Puritans of New England were the leaders. The Congregationalists of Connecticut, the Baptists of Rhode Island, the Quakers of Pennsylvania, the Swedes of Delaware, the Methodists of Georgia and Maryland were for the Revolution, for the Declaration of Independence, for the Constitution. The Catholics of Maryland were indifferent, divided by two feelings—opposition to the British crown because it was Protestant, and fear of republican forms of government because they were inconsistent with their church teaching. So

BUILDING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

what was done for the government by the Episcopal patriots of Virginia and the patriotic Catholics of Maryland was done in spite of the church and its leaders. But what was done in New England and the Central States and everywhere that Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, and Quakers were numerically strong, was done with the enthusiastic help, approbation, and leadership of the representatives of the democratic churches.

Still another interesting side light was the attitude our patriotic fathers showed in response to things ecclesiastical. Where the church's attitude was friendly toward the Revolution, the Declaration, and the Constitution they were friendly at the close of the war toward the church; but where the attitude of the church showed a strong preference for monarchical forms, as against our republic, we find that patriotic leaders by the score lost interest in organized religion and became anti-church. Tom Paine, before the Revolution, wrote the most devout documents and the most scriptural, and founded his whole ideal of government upon the teachings of the Bible; but after becoming sour because of the High-Church and Tory attitude of the Virginia clergy and their loyalty to the State Church of England, and after crossing to France and ex-

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

periencing the opposition of the Romish Church to the new republic there forming, he came back and wrote his *Age of Reason*.

Thomas Jefferson, who wrote his Declaration calling upon God and acknowledging his superintendence over us, became so indifferent to the church that by many he is considered almost an agnostic, although this belief has never been sustained by the facts. Numerous other men, trained in Virginia and brought into constant conflict with the Tory clergy, by the time they came to form the Constitution had grown so indifferent to ecclesiastical forms as representative of religion that there is a secular tone in the literary composition of the Constitution which is entirely missing in the Declaration of Independence earlier signed by these same men.

The church is the world's Bible. Every man who is outside the church has standards which he thinks the church should be measured by. No responsibility is greater than that of studying out just what civic duties the church of Christ must have. If it fails to meet these obligations in time of crisis, it will make skeptics of the most thoughtful and conscientious men.

One of the most pathetic lines in the biography of Lincoln was the utter failure of the clergy of Springfield to give him any support

BUILDING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

when he knew he was representing in his own campaigns the only moral issue there was, and he said: "I know that I am right, and these principles of freedom are taught in the Bible, and yet of the thirty or more clergy only one or two is supporting me. I cannot understand it." The same indifference alienated the affection of Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips from the church as a saving institution; and to those people who think the church may lose in being too aggressive in the temperance reform and in other civic matters, we say: "Better offend the wicked by an aggressive fight with them, and compel their respect as a power for civic righteousness, than lose the good, true, and noble by failing to do the utmost possible in helping them to make this a better world here and now."

III

JESUS CHRIST, THE EMBODIMENT OF DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

ONE half of the world is newly making the experiment of self-government—Austria, Germany, Russia, China, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia.

In every breast is that same urge to freedom that impelled our fathers, that propels us on, and that makes you an American patriot.

The thought of the day, the trend of the centuries, is to make the earth democratic. The reign of the common people is at hand; they are reaching for the scepter and the establishment of their rights, powers, and privileges. Autocratic governments of church and state must go. Even representative governments have been a disappointment. Popular government is the slogan for the day. This is not a spasm of sentiment nor a sudden impulse. It is the evolution of the ages, developing that initial impulse that God planted when he made us all to have dominion, and greatly accelerated when the Greatest of the great identified himself with the humblest of the

JESUS AND DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

humble. Then democracy became real; it was shown to be rooted in the divine will so that anyone who sought the wisdom and spirit of Jesus Christ would know that it was ordained of God. When he came his introduction was not to King Herod, the reigning monarch; nor to Pilate, the Roman governor; nor to Cæsar, but to the band of faithful shepherds keeping watch over their flocks by night.

All the forces that put the leverage of democracy under humanity and lifted us to the altitude we occupy to-day, were born in the manger of Bethlehem. The enfranchisement and establishment of man is the work of the nail-pierced hand. No unprejudiced mind can fail to note that every charter of liberty which has been wrung from the hands of greed and selfishness during the past thousand years has been closely related to the Man of Nazareth and the gospel he gave mankind. Had it not been for Jesus, for what he said and did and was, our boasted civilization could not have been. You and I would now be the bondsmen of cruel masters and the slaves of tyrants.

We are proud of our modern democracy and our American civilization, but it has not always been what it now is. As we look at the path we have trod, the distance we have come, and the forces which have impelled us forward,

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

we discover at the head of every advance the Captain of our Salvation. It is a long distance from the stone pillars and the bloody altars of the Druid temples to the beautiful and spiritual worship of our sanctuaries, "none daring to molest or make us afraid." There have been many bloody battles, many painful crosses between the two, but amid the din of danger and the scorching fires of every persecution there has arisen some leader whose tongue of fire has been inspired by the love of Jesus calling men to a higher, purer, and better life. And they have not toiled in vain. Mankind has grown, human liberty has advanced, the race has been emancipated, and the religion of Jesus in divine accord with national democracy has promoted all these rights of man.

What, then, is the relation of Jesus Christ and his gospel to these democracies? He is the founder of them. They proceed from him. He is the source, the life, the soul of them all. Without what he did and said and was, they never could have been. He never made democracy a formal topic of discourse. Our phrases, "the democracy of knowledge," "the democracy of art," "the democracy of politics" are not found on his lips. Nevertheless, Jesus is the creator and the architect of democracy.

JESUS AND DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

It would not be difficult to show that the New Testament is a handbook of democratic principles. Jesus could not preach the doctrine of God's Fatherhood without reverting to human brotherhood. He was asked once, "What is the greatest commandment?" His answer was that there were two, and not one. A theologian might have answered, "The great commandment is, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart.'" But Jesus added, "The second is like unto the first: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.'" This was startling doctrine to Jews who called Gentiles dogs, to Greeks who called all others barbarians, to Romans who called all others Plebes; but Jesus built Christianity on the doctrines of race equality and human brotherhood.

When Jesus came to deal with the people his favorite term for himself was "The Son of man," a term that is the most democratic that could be put into human speech. Not "The Son of a king" or of a priest, or of a royal family, or of a class, or of a nation, but "The Son of man." He told how the rabbis made "broad their phylacteries, and enlarged the borders of *their garments*, and love the chief place at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and the salutations in the market

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

places, and to be called of men Rabbi. But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your teacher, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father on the earth: for one is your Father, *even* he who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master, *even* Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled; and whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted" (Matt. 23. 6-12).

On another occasion: "There arose also a contention among them, which of them was accounted to be greatest. And he said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles have lordship over them; and they that have authority over them are called Benefactors. But ye *shall* not *be* so: but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. For which is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am in the midst of you as he that serveth" (Luke 22. 24-27).

One needs only to read the life of Jesus in the four Gospels to be perfectly saturated with the principles of democracy, the equality of men, the dignity of the poor, the stricken, the sinful and the diseased, and of the humilia-

JESUS AND DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

tion of those who wore purple if the life was sinful.

If one will study the treatment of Herod Antipas, of the governor Pilate, and of the high priest before whom Jesus stood, and will see the utter contempt for the trappings of authority that the Son of man displayed, he will see that the greatest Democrat that ever walked the earth never cringed before arbitrary authority.

On one occasion some elated disciples came to Jesus with the good news that he had a royal caller. Herod, the king, stood outside desiring to see him. Christ turned for a moment from his discourse where the common people had heard him gladly, and said, "Go and say to that fox that I work to-day, to-morrow, and the third day I am glorified," and went on with his message to the people as though the slight interruption of a king's call had never occurred.

The greatest compliment he ever paid to any man was when he said, "Among those born of women there hath not arisen one greater than John the Baptist." The significance of this one can readily get by letting the imagination run upon the facts that John was the humble wilderness preacher whom the reigning monarch had recently executed. The

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

sycophant would have climaxed his speeches with the greatness of Herod and stood in with those in authority, but Jesus puts the crown on the head of the one who has been executed.

In the study of our government Charles W. Eliot has shown that America achieved a reform that no other people ever attempted, and he is thus quoted by Bryce, in his *American Commonwealth*, volume two, page 649, and Bryce, the world observer himself, says, "Of all the differences between the Old World and the New, this is the most salient: the separation of the church from the state." Where did America get this thought? It was Christ who laid down the principles that the church and the state are separate. "And the scribes and the chief priests sought to lay hands on him in that very hour; and they feared the people: for they perceived that he spake this parable against them. And they watched him, and sent forth spies, who feigned themselves to be righteous, that they might take hold of his speech, so as to deliver him up to the rule and to the authority of the governor. And they asked him, saying, Teacher, we know that thou sayest and teachest rightly, and acceptest not the person of *any*, but of a truth teachest the way of God: Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not? But he perceived

JESUS AND DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

their craftiness, and said unto them, Show me a denarius." Holding it in hand, he inquired, "Whose image and superscription hath it?" And they said, "Cæsar's." And he said unto them, "Then render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's. And they were not able to take hold of the saying before the people: and they marveled at his answer, and held their peace" (Luke 20. 19-26). They observed that he had answered a specific question definitely but stated an everlasting principle of government that gives freedom from all trammels for religion and liberates the state as well.

Jesus was "the sower who went forth to sow." He planted the seed of democracy from which sprang the great tree of human liberty under whose wide-spreading boughs we and our children sit in equity and power. He gave to the world the radical, underlying idea of all democracy, of all social growth, and of all human rights. How? By giving man a new sense of the capacities, the relations, the duties, and the destiny of man. The logical and inevitable result of his teachings and life and being has been to make real and vital these facts: that the world was made for all and not for a few; that every human soul is of immeasurable worth; that every man has the

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

divine right, coequal with every other man, to come to himself; that "every human being, whatever his lot or station or wealth or race, has noble powers to cultivate, solemn duties to perform, unalienable rights to assert, and a vast destiny to accomplish."

The only idea that can give this high order of equality, promise, and potency is that every man is too sacred, that every man is too precious, that every man is too great, to be awed by priest or church or king or baron. That idea Jesus made effectual in the world. Do you ask me how he did it? If the late Matthew Arnold, the distinguished representative of the highest intellectual culture of our times, should have selected twelve plain, ordinary, ungifted men, if he should have associated himself with them on terms of equality and familiarity every day, if he should have publicly appointed them as the inner circle of his disciples through whom his ideas of culture were to be made known to the world, such selection and association would be equivalent to a declaration on Mr. Arnold's part that he believed these men to be capable of the highest, the finest, the most perfect culture.

And when He, who is greater than all apostles of culture, came and selected twelve such men, by virtue of that very act he declared that

JESUS AND DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

the humblest men were equal to the highest things.

Mark the openess, the entire freedom, with which he gave his deepest truths to the plainest men. He preached his Sermon on the Mount, as we are assured by all scholars, to a motley crowd of ignorant peasants and rude fishermen. They were gathered from the Galilæan Lake and the Galilæan hills, and he preached to them the longest sermon he ever preached and containing some of the deepest truths to which he ever gave utterance. To this audience of ordinary men and women, and not at Jerusalem to the educated and cultured and refined, did he freely give these great ideals.

In all systems of theology the doctrine of God is justly declared to be the highest theme. The doctrine of God with Jesus was certainly his highest theme, and to whom and in what circumstances did he most fully declare his doctrine of God? To one person—to a woman. Not to a woman like Susannah Wesley or Frances Willard or Clara Barton, but to a woman whose name even has not come down to us, to a woman not only unknown and obscure, but to a lax woman, and to a woman who was a heretic. To that woman Jesus taught his doctrine of God. To that woman

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

he declared that it was not a question of Gerezim or Moriah. To that woman he declared that the question was not where God should be worshiped, but how. To that woman he declared, "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth." They who will may fling scornful sneers at the degraded outcast, but while any portion of his spirit fills my heart or guides my life I will not cease to remember that Jesus gave his doctrine of God to a lax, heretical woman. Does not that begin to make men and women shine with an unusual luster? Do you treat them in that way? Do the schools? does society? does the church? But Jesus did.

Consider his doctrine of the superiority of men to institutions, to all customs and traditions and policies however venerable and however sacred. Our Master never once lost sight of that truth so fully embodied in his gospel, that institutions, ceremonies, ordinances, customs, and policies exist for man, and not man for these institutions. You have seen the bark on the tree. What would be thought of the men who would insist that the tree lived for the bark? Of what use is the casket except to preserve the jewel? He who would think of teaching that the casket was more important than the jewel would be considered unworthy of

JESUS AND DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

hearing. Precisely at this point Jesus came into collision with the religious teachers of his times. They thought that everything depended upon preserving the bark, and practically they also said, "If the tree will not behave itself concerning the bark, why, away with the tree!" They had built up about the law a hedge, high, thorny, prickly. They were trying to keep the law on the other side, trying to protect it. Their end was noble, their object pure, but the means they employed were narrow, cruel, dwarfing, inimical to the highest moral growth of the human race. He came, and they began to rebuke him because of his nonobservance of the law, because his disciples ate with unwashed hands, because they rubbed barley between their hands in passing through the field on the Sabbath day. And how did he answer them? Did you ever see the lightning leap from the bosom of the peaceful cloud? So hot and scorching wrath came from the Lamb of God as "Woe! Woe! Woe!" leaped and poured upon the men who taught that institutions were more sacred than man himself.

By the whole course of his life and teaching our Lord lifted men above all institutions, declaring that institutions are to serve men, and that when men grew too large for existing institutions they were to be displaced by such as

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

were adequate to the growing, expanding life of man. Jesus Christ came to unfetter and enfranchise men, to build up in this world a type of manhood in harmony with his own character, and to bless and beautify his own kingdom. He himself is the ideal man, the perfect man, and God has been framing the ages to produce in the kingdom of his Son and by the power of his Spirit a complete and perfect manhood.

Jesus Christ considered the individual of infinite value. He put them all on the same plane, and this principle of his not only condemns monarchy but it forever rejects the ancient idea that the individual exists for the church, or for the state, or for the most sacred institutions. So when Christ was healing sick people, restoring sight to the blind, doing good even on the Sabbath day, those who put institutions ahead of men were mortally offended. Disciples who had watched him at his work without taking time to eat, grew so hungry that passing through the fields of corn they broke off the ripened ears on the Sabbath day, but the worshipers of institutions were horrified. "And the Pharisees said unto him, Behold, why do they on the Sabbath day that which is not lawful? And he said unto them, Did ye never read what David did, when he

JESUS AND DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

had need, and was hungry, he, and they that were with him? How he entered into the house of God when Abiathar was high priest, and ate the showbread, which it is not lawful to eat save for the priests, and gave also to them that were with him? And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath: so that the Son of man is lord even of the sabbath" (Mark 2. 24-27).

One cannot pick up at random anything about Jesus without being impressed with his democratic spirit. Every principle he stated, every example he set, every doctrine he inculcated, was democratic. One need not look for texts; they cluster about almost any narrative of his life.

"Now before the feast of the Passover, Jesus knowing that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own that were in the world, he loved them unto the end. . . . knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he came forth from God, and goeth unto God, riseth from supper, and layeth aside his garments; and he took a towel, and girded himself. Then he poureth water into the basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded" (John 13. 1-5). Thus he

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

taught for three years that he is greatest who is the servant of all, that greatness in the kingdom of heaven is not through heredity, position, honor, education, or even qualifications, but is in the spirit and act of service. "He that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is chief as he that doth serve." He now adds this impressive object lesson to show that as their Lord and Master he was not above serving the humblest, and it is no wonder that the apostles went out from such association to teach that "there can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one *man* in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3. 28); and if ye are Christ's, the fictitious distinctions of race, class, rulership, freedom or slavery, male supremacy or female rights, all melt away in the oneness of Christian love and by the power of Christ's own example who never taught the Divine Fatherhood apart from its implications of human brotherhood.

There is a significant reference *to the democracy of the disciples trained under Jesus* found in Acts 4. 1, 2. "And as they spake unto the people, the priests and the captain of the temple and the Sadducees came upon them, being sore troubled because they taught the people."

JESUS AND DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

We often quote this text as if the trouble of the ruling classes grew out of the fact that they were teaching people Christianity, but the text specifically teaches that the rulers were troubled because they were teaching the people at all. Their estimate of the people was, "This multitude that know not the law are accursed." It never occurred to them that the ignorance of the masses is the disgrace and crime of the classes who have deprived their brethren and equals of the sources and means of knowledge.

After our New Testament the next document that clearly states Christ's principles that the most sacred institutions are but a means for the use of the end, *man*, is the Declaration of Independence. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," and every proposition in the immortal Declaration is a New-Testament fundamental doctrine: all men equal; endowed by their Creator; inalienable rights to life, liberty, happiness; governments instituted for man and

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

his rights, not men maintained for the protection and expansion of the state; states gaining their right to exist only by consent of the governed. These were the doctrines proclaimed by Jesus, elaborated by Paul and by John, and no one can study the New Testament as a source book of American principles without discovering Jesus Christ to be the creator and founder of modern democracy.

It is no wonder that the Virgin Mary, with the prophetic afflatus upon her, giving expression to the mission of the Child who was to be born of her, should have shown that a distinctive mission of his life was not only to glorify God and teach his Fatherhood but also to make the world democratic.

“He hath showed strength with his arm;
He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their heart.
He hath put down princes from *their* thrones,
And hath exalted them of low degree.
The hungry he hath filled with good things;
And the rich he hath sent empty away.”

He hath obliterated fictitious distinctions,
He hath leveled the mountains that were insurmountable to the masses,
And hath exalted the valleys of humanity to the levels of the hills.

IV

IS THE UNITED STATES A CHRISTIAN NATION?

WE are often told that public speakers, especially in the pulpit, should avoid personalities. I hope it will not be thought that I too much violate this standard of good taste in discussing the question, "Is Uncle Sam a Christian?"

To this question, "Is Uncle Sam a Christian?" there are thoughtless writers and speakers who claim that because the name of God is not in our Constitution, the assembly that formed our government was atheistical. To jump to such a conclusion is to break away from all the facts of our history, the inclinations of our people, the commitments of our institutions, and the heredity, education, and environment of our fathers.

To say that the assembly that formed our Constitution was atheistical contradicts all the facts of history. When the delegates of the thirteen colonies assembled to form our Constitution, five weeks passed without result, and in hopeless confusion the assembly was

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

about to break up when Benjamin Franklin, of four-score years, arose and said:

“Mr. President, I perceive that we are not in condition to pursue this business any further. Our blood is too hot. We indeed seem to feel our own want of political wisdom, since we have been running about in search of it. We have gone back to ancient history for models of governments and examined the different forms of those republics which, having been formed with the seeds of their own dissolution, now no longer exist. In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark, to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of lights to illuminate our understandings? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible to danger, we had daily prayer in this room for divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard; and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending Providence in our favor.

“To that kind Providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting, in peace, on the means of establishing our future national fe-

IS THE UNITED STATES CHRISTIAN?

licity; and have we now forgotten that powerful Friend? Or do we imagine that we no longer need his assistance? I have lived, sir, a long time; and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid?

“We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings, that ‘except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.’ I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without his concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword down to future ages; and, what is worse, mankind may hereafter from this unfortunate instance despair of establishing governments by human wisdom, and leave it to chance, war, and conquest.

“I therefore, move you, sir, that we separate for three days, during which time in a conciliatory spirit we talk with both parties; for if ever we make a constitution it must be the work of compromise;¹ and while I am on my

¹Over the then existing evil of chattel slavery.

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

feet I move you, sir, and I am astonished that it has not been done before, for when we signed the Declaration of Independence we had a chaplain to read the Bible and pray; and I move now that when we meet again we have a chaplain to meet with us each morning before we proceed to business, and that we have prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven and its blessings on our deliberations."

Washington's face beamed with joy as he stood to second the motion. At the end of three days they met, had prayer together, and without a jar formed our Constitution, which Gladstone has pronounced the "greatest state document of all Christian ages."

Seeking thus divine guidance, is it not a natural conclusion that our fathers diligently searched his Word for light in their dilemma?

These men had adopted the Declaration of Independence only a little while before the Constitution, "appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions," and "with firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence," and we should remember that, as already stated, the very dollar with which we pay our debts proclaims to the world the truth, "In God We Trust."

Those of you who remember the episode of a few years ago when Mr. Roosevelt as Presi-

IS THE UNITED STATES CHRISTIAN?

dent recommended the removal of those words from the silver dollar, know just how much they mean to the American people. They may not live up to their professions always, but they will tolerate no tampering with their standards; and the perfect hornets' nest that the great President stirred up when he suggested the removal of those words from the currency of the nation will prevent its ever being attempted again. It may be interesting to know how this sentiment got on our money and why they sought to remove it.

"In God We Trust" first appeared on the copper two-cent piece, issued in 1864, during Lincoln's administration and is the first use of the word "God" on any government money issued. This suggestion came from James Pollock, an ex-governor of Pennsylvania, who was director of the Mint, and it had the approval of Salmon P. Chase, then secretary of the treasury and one of the greatest American statesmen. It appeared in the 1866 issue of the double eagle, the eagle and half eagle; also on the dollar, half dollar and nickel five-cent piece in lieu of the long existing motto "E Pluribus Unum."

In the trade dollar issue of 1873 both mottoes were retained; "In God We Trust" appearing on the obverse side of the silver dollar

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

and half-dollar and nickel five-cent piece, and on the other side the motto "E Pluribus Unum." These national sentiments have appeared on all important coins since, as a reminder that this nation owes its allegiance to something higher than politics and higher than money. It is not a sectarian sentiment. It does not offend a Jew or Mohammedan, or a deist even, but reminds the American people that life consists of more than meat and the body more than raiment, and that commercialism can never make a nation any more than it can build an individual character.

Why was it proposed to remove this sentiment from the nation's money? Was it because we had learned our lesson so well that we were in no danger of falling into a life of mere commercialism? Was it because we had risen so high in the moral and spiritual scale as to need no further reminders of that Power higher than ourselves that works for righteousness? Was it because somebody objected to the sentiment expressed?

One reason assigned by the President was that he had heard slighting remarks about it by certain of his companions, and he did not wish to see the sentiment ridiculed. But was there ever a noble sentiment or an unselfish act, or a great moral effort that was not sus-

IS THE UNITED STATES CHRISTIAN?

ceptible of ridicule and cheap facetiousness? I have heard men warning public audiences against our drift toward materialism and commercialism say, "If we continue in this direction we shall soon have to change our motto to 'In Gold We Trust' instead of the old-fashioned sentiment about God." But it never occurred to me that because of such a facetious remark we should haul down our flag for fear the enemy would fire upon it.

This is of a piece with a criticism I heard about the American Revision of the Bible, generally agreed to be the best translation of the original now extant. A friend of mine objects to the version because the word "Jehovah" is given wherever that name for the Deity occurs in the original, instead of following the example of the old version in substituting the word "Lord." This friend fears that the name "Jehovah" being thus prominently brought out will soon be used in swearing, which would shock him very much! My remedy would be to instill principles of reverence, or at least of social decency, to prevent swearing. His remedy seems to be to keep the world in ignorance of this noble name lest they should misuse it.

The last man in our national history whom I would have expected to advocate lowering

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

standards in order to prevent higher standards from being misrepresented, was the manly and righteous Roosevelt; and much as I admired him, I must maintain that we still need the elevating, educating and inspiring sentiment on every silver coin issued by our national Mint—"In God We Trust." And if the sentiment is not strictly true, there are ministers and missionaries, teachers and lecturers, editors and authors enough to lift our people up to a moral plane on which it shall be true.

During the Civil War a Negro color bearer in the thick of the fight was beckoned to by the colonel of his regiment, who cried, "Bring those colors back to the line." The excited and patriotic Negro, however, responded, "You bring that line up to the colors; these colors cannot come back." Let us not drop our colors to any lower level. I would rather join with those who sing:

"She's been in many a fix since 1776,
But the old flag never touched the ground."

Noah Webster, in the Preface of his great dictionary, wrote: "The United States commenced their existence under circumstances wholly novel and unexampled in the history of nations. They commenced with civilization, with learning, with science, with arts, with a

IS THE UNITED STATES CHRISTIAN?

constitution of free government, and with the best gift of God to man, the Christian religion."

All the progress of past ages was required to produce a people capable of maintaining our form of government, for no nation can maintain a better form of government than it can make. All the elements of good in past progress were gathered up in the ideals of the national rights of man to govern himself, and of religious liberty for all. This plan conceived in the minds of a few procured for them the appellation of "Puritans," and before they could find a field adapted to the making of their experiment they had all become Pilgrims. But their sentiment appealing to the natural instincts and strongest desires for man found a response in the best material of every civilized nation, and Plymouth Rock became the nucleus of world-wide growth toward freedom.

Our nation is classed among the nations of the world as a Christian republic. It was settled by Christians, who came to glorify God and extend the influence of the Christian religion. A reading of the charters of New England, of the grants of land to the Virginia, Connecticut, and Massachusetts colonies will astound the average person with the number

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

and fullness of the declarations that the land belongs to God, that they were going across to extend the honor of his name and the Christian religion. The Constitution of the States recognized that the Christian religion is a true religion, that the Holy Scriptures of the New and Old Testaments are of divine inspiration and are the rule of faith and practice and underlie all enactments, constitutional and statutory. Those who look up the charters of the colleges which have helped to make our history will be equally surprised to find that they are "for the propagation of the pure gospel of Christ, our only Mediator, to the praise and honor of Almighty God."

A significant fact is the recognition of Sunday, the Lord's Day, as a Christian Sabbath and therefore as an American institution. The United States Constitution provides that the President shall have ten days to consider all bills. If he disapproves, he returns it with his veto, and then it specifies that if it is not returned by him within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, it becomes a law. Similar provisions have been found in the Constitutions of most of the States and in thirty-six out of forty-eight the words "Sundays excepted" are included.

IS THE UNITED STATES CHRISTIAN?

In Louisiana they left out these words in the revision of their Constitution in 1864, and the question of the governor's veto came up in the supreme court. That court decided that these words are constructively there, because this is a Christian state and Sunday is a part of our Christian institution and therefore implied. The court, therefore, unanimously held that Sunday was to be excluded in the count.

This constitutional provision, of course, justifies all the long chain of Sabbath legislation designed to protect the workingman in his right to rest and the Christian Church in its right to worship and the Christian citizen in his right to a quiet day.

The name of God frequently appears in the State Constitutions and courts. You find the words in the Preamble to the Constitutions of the various States, "Grateful to Almighty God," and by Constitution and statute the official oaths are to close with the words, "So help me God." The common commencement of wills is, "In the name of God, Amen," and every foreigner attests his renunciation of allegiance to his former sovereign and his acceptance of citizenship in this republic by an appeal to God. The employment of chaplains in the army and navy, as officers of legislative assemblies, the whole range of their service,

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

whether in prayer or preaching, is an official recognition of Christianity. If we should turn to the decision of the courts, we find them unanimous that the Christian religion is a part of the common law of the several States.

It is not surprising in the light of these facts that a committee of patriots consisting of Dr. Franklin, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson appointed on the same day that the Declaration of Independence was adopted to prepare a seal for the United States, should have proposed a scriptural device, a picture of Pharaoh in an open chariot, a crown on his head and a sword in his hand, passing through the dividing waters of the Red Sea in pursuit of the Israelites, with rays from the pillar of fire beaming on Moses, who is represented as standing on the shore extending his hand over the sea, and causing it to overwhelm Pharaoh's hosts. Surrounding this picture is the motto: "Rebellion to Tyrants is Obedience to God."

But if we were to undertake the recital of the borrowings from the Bible in the early laws and customs of our colonies, we should be reproducing the Pentateuch and delivering a volume instead of a lecture. The Massachusetts historical collection shows that the Bay colony refused to use the English common law and adopted the Pentateuch. They

IS THE UNITED STATES CHRISTIAN?

made a code from this called "The Body of Liberties," which was copied *verbatim* from Moses. A common topic for sermons during the Revolutionary period was "The Republic of the Israelites an Example to the American States." It was after a sermon on this subject before the general court, June 5, 1788, by Dr. Langdon, that the State of New Hampshire met and adopted the United States Constitution.

As truly as Keppler has said, "An undevout astronomer is mad," so may we aver, "An undevout American is mad"; for, while the astronomer sees the marks of design in the stellar world, we see the proofs of God's care in the freedom of body, mind, and spirit that we enjoy.

When Columbus was two thirds way across the ocean on his first voyage of discovery the prow of his vessels was pointed for the Delaware Bay, but a flock of birds passed over his little fleet going to the southwest. Judging that land lay in that direction, Pinton persuaded the admiral to change the course of his ships and so he landed on a small island of the West Indies.

The secularist closes his eyes in this to all but a flight of birds; but the Christian opens his, and sees the hand of God directing that if

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

Spanish misrule is to curse any part of this hemisphere, it should be confined to the southern islands; and that this North American continent should be saved to become the base for the greatest continuous empire of mankind and the cradle for a multiplying nation of English-speaking Protestants. "Never," said Humboldt, the Prussian philosopher, "had a flight of birds such important consequences."

John Richard Green, the greatest historian of the English people, recounts the popularity and power of John Wesley's preaching, describes the number of his societies and his marvelous system of church government, and then says: "He recreated England. But for the new life created by the Wesleyan revival Pitt could never have come into power in the British government, as there would have been nothing on which he could stand."

He then shows that Pitt in one decade, by the sword of Wolfe, drove the French beyond the Saint Lawrence, and made this great Protestant English-speaking people possible.

In the same decade he drove the French out of the Indies and rescued that empire of three hundred millions for Protestant Christianity.

He rescued Frederick the Great from the French and the Spaniards and so preserved the German nation.

IS THE UNITED STATES CHRISTIAN?

These three greatest Protestant nations on earth arose under God's providence from the evangelical fervor created by one man raised up in the nick of time.

That God destined this country to be the home of civil and religious liberty and the torch-bearer of democracy is shown in its natural resources and its providential discovery and religious settlement. "The Lord sitteth upon his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all." He carries out his will by human leaders. Nations are his greatest agents. The Hebrew Scriptures show us God in his world. The fault of our historians is that they ignore this and try to rule God out of his own realm.

The foundations of national life are moral. If these fail, the structure falls, and it ought to fall. "Where the carcass is, there will the vultures be gathered together." Our annals are chiefly of dead nations; for nations have special divine missions. When they fail God puts them aside. They have no future life; their judgment must therefore come in this world.

We are deeply interested in the lands that rule the world. What shall be their future? We know that morality is the life of the nation; and that religion is the life of morals,

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

and if the principles of the divine kingdom be breathed into our constitution and laws, into our public and private life, we shall endure,

“Till the sun grows cold,
And the stars are old,
And the leaves of the judgment book unfold.”

To this end some trust in preparedness and some are “too proud to fight.” But I say, let us get back to the conscience of the people. The highest statesmanship in a government like this is to line up the people to a simple proposition in righteousness as often as possible. Make it increasingly clear that while the principle is old there are ever new applications of the truth that “Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.”

As a people we do well to take note of national blessings. They indicate our obligation and stimulate our gratitude and reveal the source of our mercies. The heavens rule; the government is in the hands of the manger cradle, the thorn-crowned King, the Son of God. By him governments are set up, rulers decree justice, and national structures stand or fall, flourish or decay. On his head are many crowns, and he rules the world in the interest of man's redemption, the outcome of

IS THE UNITED STATES CHRISTIAN?

which must be righteousness, justice, and everlasting peace.

For the epoch of our national life and for the bounds of our habitation—both of them by divine appointment—we have cause for thanksgiving, for God has not dealt so with any nation; no such heritage has he given to any other people. He has placed us at the highest era of the world's progress in civilization and culture, climate and landscape, that this fair planet can afford. He has gathered to us out of all the nations a population that makes us half brother to the world, with something good and bad from every land. In the use of free and enlightened institutions with the blessing of Providence, we may cast off the brute inheritance of an evil past and rise to become the crowning race of human kind, leading the world to its millennial day. Let us thank God for an outlook so inspiring.

Through all our changes the one great idea of human liberty sailed in safety, and, notwithstanding the clamor of men, the measures and platforms of political parties, this great idea of human liberty has held the ascendancy every moment, and the principles of democracy have never suffered a wreck. Bodies politic, like natural bodies, die, but principles, like souls, are immortal. Our government, based

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

on the capability of man to govern himself, is founded on God's decree of man's freedom; and thus, as the Latin maxim says, "The voice of the people is the voice of God." Whatever the majority of the nation does is democracy. When and wherever the people rule there is a democratic triumph. Democracy may have many desires, frame many petitions, and make many requests, but can never have but one article of faith, and that is founded on man's inalienable right and capacity for self-government, and it never can depart from the right of the people to rule.

In the great religious commotions that arose beyond the Atlantic the best blood of Europe came to this country seeking religious freedom. There was a religious basis to every colony. The great revival of 1740 was a natural outgrowth of the characteristics of the settlers. Tens of thousands were brought into the church, and those foundations of a freedom-loving, Bible-reading nation were laid before the Revolution broke out. From then till now we have demonstrated that it is possible for a nation to exist with no King but Jesus, and no government but the free, untrammelled will of a sovereign people, who believe in and worship God and live his Golden Rule.

Many have been the misgivings and fears

IS THE UNITED STATES CHRISTIAN?

of good men lest the ark which bears the family of God to glory should founder in the storm. The fear is needless. Learn a parable of the scanty relics of our race, once drifting upon the surge, without a compass, helmsman, sun, or stars to pilot them—yet they were undevoured. A sleepless Eye kept watch upon their vessel's course, an unwearied Arm guided them to their summit of repose; thence they went forth to repair the waste places and to replenish the earth—a type of mercy rejoicing against judgment.

Thus far the old ship, constructed by the wisdom and launched by the strength of our fathers, has weathered the storm on her own as well as foreign seas. She has passed out of harbor in a gale, crossed the bar in a heavy land swell, and run far beyond the heaving of the angry surf. She has encountered the broad ocean and felt the shock of the raging storm; and, in proud defiance of the angry elements, she still floats, a monument of the wisdom of her great builders and of God's providential care.

“Thou too sail on, O Ship of State,
Sail on, O Union, strong and great.
Humanity with all its fears,
With all its hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate.”

V

PAGAN INROADS ON AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

DURING the World War two men were conversing on a car seat back of me. One said, "Germany is nothing but a pagan nation." That remark started a train of thought; and I said to myself: "That man is mistaken. Germany is not a pagan land; she is a Christian nation secularized, or, as the Methodists would say, 'back-slidden.'"

One hundred years ago she was the most Christian nation in Europe and represented the purest type of Christianity. She was the most thoroughly committed to the Christian ideals in her institutions, her professions, traditions, and the grip of her Bible upon the literature and education of her people. We boast of our King James Version and its influence over the English-speaking people, but it was no greater than Martin Luther's marvelous translation of the same Scriptures into the German tongue, and its hold upon the German civilization.

There came a day when the native conceit went to work, through the process called

PAGAN INROADS

“higher criticism,” to undermine the faith of the people in the integrity of their own Book, by negative processes of studying the letter of the Bible for eliminations, mistakes, and oversights. They did not look for principles or precepts or promises—but for errors. They had a buzzard’s scent for carrion. These critics, hunting the Bible for mistakes, remind one of the darkey who took a dark lantern on a dark night and went down into a dark cellar to find a black cat that was not there. With an imagination that was characteristic, they cut up the Bible and formed it into a crazy-quilt, and carried on a picking process until it was in shreds and the faith of the people in the integrity of the Book was gone.

They then adopted a system of rationalism by which they explained away everything that was left in the faith of the people; the old Book and its inspiration, the virgin birth and the resurrection of Christ, regeneration and the Pentecost, all evaporated in a rationalistic atmosphere.

Next it was easy to adopt a system of philosophy known as materialism, by which everything reasonable was denied and thought was reduced to physical forces at play in the brain. The universe was without a Head, and force was without a law or a Lawgiver. This left

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

spirit a nonentity, immortality a delusion, and God was dismissed as irrational.

They banished the Bible from the public school systems, turned the Sabbath into a Continental Sunday of beer-drinking, gambling, and brutal pleasures, and made the most debauching of drinks known to mankind the national beverage—beer, the scientific effect of which on its drinker is that the last traits that are developed in the human evolution are the first to go down. As soon as one begins the drinking of beer he commences to move downstairs. After a while he drags his feet along, drags his thoughts, and drags his soul. Speak to one, and his voice is not a human voice but a brutal growl, and the degrading effect seen in every individual beer-drinker showed forth in the nation that adopted it.

When religion had evaporated there was nothing for morals to stand on. You cannot build a moral system without a religious basis. You cannot have a brotherhood of man unless you have the Fatherhood of God to establish the relation. Drag down on the Godward side and the manward side will not hold up. I never knew a man or nation that had a stronger left-hand grasp on human brotherhood than his right-hand hold on God and destiny. Some people think religion and mor-

PAGAN INROADS

als are separate and can be kept in different compartments. They are not separate nor different parts of something. They are absolutely one. Religion is morality in relation to God. Morality is religion in relation to man. When religion and morals were demolished the brutalizing effect of her skepticism, low-grade life, and beer-drinking had completed the obliteration of a great Christian nation.

To know by fruitage has the Saviour's sanction. The civilized world in death-grapple is trying to throw off the ideals of German rationalism, to repudiate her system of criticism, and even to find a better philosophy. Why? Because the race stands appalled in the presence of the fruit that grew on that tree. A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit. It was no different on this side of the water. The attempt to get an expression from five hundred German professors in American colleges condemning the policy of frightfulness of their Fatherland fell flat. With only eighteen exceptions they all stood for it.

Let us take our stand against any imposition of their theology, their morals, their philosophy, or their critical methods upon our church. Their emasculated Christianity will not do in America. Their rationalized Christ is not our Saviour. Their crazy-quilt Bible is not our

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

Holy Scripture. Their brutalizing beverage ought to go out of America forever. You can't prop up moral distinctions so they will stand without religion for a base. You can't build a religion on negatives. When you get far enough away from it the whole story of the so-called higher critic will appear the silliest fad and the most excuseless craze ever adopted by Christian citizens of the nineteenth century, a process by which they, seated on the outer end, sawed off the limb of the tree of life on which they themselves were resting.

The process which had decivilized Germany would be equally destructive to Christian democracy in the United States; and if I had my way as an American, I would have my Uncle Sam face that stairway down which Germany ran to ruin and put his feet on every one of those steps, and walk over them in the opposite direction—upstairs.

THE STEPS UPSTAIRS

1. We should maintain the strictest kind of law enforcement and an educational agitation that will hold all officers to the standard of their oath of office, from the President, who swears to protect, defend, and enforce the Constitution, to the sheriff and policeman, who are under oath to enforce without fear or favorit-

PAGAN INROADS

ism the laws of the State and the ordinances of the cities. We will never consent to the nomination, or, if nominated, the election of any man as President of these United States who opposes prohibition, would be lukewarm in its enforcement, or who proposes to tinker with the people's law rather than make the law a success and the government a triumph by seeing that the people live up to their own standards. We should follow this policy down the line to governors, sheriffs, district attorneys, and other representatives of the people. Let reverence for law be breathed upon the conscience of America. A republic is in danger at this point. The people are so close to the processes of making their own laws that they are not in awe of the lawbook or the courthouse, as they are where their government is handed down to them from a so-called "higher source." All the more reason why we should teach respect for law, obey it ourselves, and see that it is obeyed by others. If we continue to sow the spirit of lawlessness with reference to the Eighteenth Amendment, we will reap the whirlwind when it is too late to get to shelter.

2. We should inaugurate a total abstinence pledge signing campaign in view of the help that abstainers are now getting by the removal

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

of organized and legalized temptation from their path. A man may get liquor in some places if he hunts it, but, thank God, the cities of America are not hunting down men who wish to quit, and now that prohibition has crippled the public traffic, education and scientific instruction in the effect of alcohol, narcotics and opiates with appeal to the will through the motives of home life, and the power of example should supplement the purpose of the law by eliminating the private habit. Beer is the most brutalizing beverage known to man. It leaves brutality uncontrolled, and one needs no further proof of this truth known than Germany.

3. It is time for church, state, and school to start an educational and moral suasion campaign against the personal use of the doped cigarette foisted upon the country in war times. Men who were able to throw off the nicotine in the activities of the field, the march, and the strenuous life of the trench are going to pieces utterly in the sedentary habits which they enter upon their return to civil life. Their eyes must be opened to this poisonous habit. The tobacco interests, by their methods, have gone so far beyond the pale of decency that they should be rebuked by the American people for trampling on their rights in war

PAGAN INROADS

times. Those lying advertisements, "Cigarettes won the war," should bring the blush of shame to every American who fought or had a loved one in the war. We must do something about this. If we do not wake up, the tobacco interests will repeal every law we now have against selling cigarettes to minors. They would not only make it universal among men, but they are organizing to make it the custom among women and children.

4. As we have seen what a secularized nation comes to when it casts off the true religion, and lest we go the same way, we should insist that the whole Bible, fountain of classic English, the book that has given us our national ideals and our moral standards, the book that taught us the equality of man and the need for his moral betterment, shall come back to the public schools of the United States as it was before certain hyphenated citizens who owe their first allegiance to a foreign potentate, crowded it out of the back door of the little red school house from four fifths of our American cities, and would thus deprive our American citizens of an intellectual foundation for American morality. The Bible that Washington kissed, that Lincoln loved, that Theodore Roosevelt lived, should return as the heritage of American children, that they may have some

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

knowledge of the book that has made our type of civilization possible.

5. Instead of importing the Continental Sunday, with its loose morals and low ideals, we should replace our American Sabbath on its civic foundations as it stood before it was trampled in the dust of our American cities to establish on its ruins a Continental Sunday, foreign to our forms of government and inimical to the morals of our people. We need the Sabbath day for the sake of the men and women who toil, for the support of the family life of the republic, that the father and mother who are separated in the shop and factories of the week may have one day when the old loves and sentiments that brought them together shall reassert their potent spell over their lives and hold together the affections of home life. We need it for the opportunity of the church to keep the moral standards parallel with the mental advance and material welfare. We need it for the intellectual life of American workers and for the sake of decent courtesy to the prevailing religion.

6. We should establish red-light abatement laws in every city and State and the teaching of old-fashioned American morality that stands for the clean life for two, for equal standards of decency in both sexes, for a pure

PAGAN INROADS

American home life such as our Pilgrim Fathers and mothers brought to Plymouth Rock and planted on American soil, the fruition of which is American civilization.

7. We must give a strong push on the wheels of the anti-prizefighting movement. Our boys saw enough scenes of blood and fields of carnage during the war, which is altogether responsible for this present carnival of crime we are witnessing, without our still further brutalizing mankind by turning bruising and blood-letting into a sport for the education of our youth away from the higher reaches of their manhood to the lower levels of the brute.

There is hardly a State where organized and well-financed propaganda is not at work at this moment and scarcely a State Legislature can meet without the sinister influence of the confederated interests that prey showing their hand. I have just crossed the continent and been in sixteen States, and in every one the symptoms were unmistakable. One State was legalizing race-track gambling. Another was trying to repeal the law against the selling of cigarettes to minors. Another was trying to annul the red-light abatement laws. Four of them were seeking to nullify the Eighteenth Amendment, though every officer in them knew that his oath of office required him to provide

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

for its enforcement. Three States were trying to abolish the Sabbath laws that protect the workingmen and their homes. In all of these States were newspapers that before prohibition banished liquor advertisements, were not in partnership with the liquor traffic, and yet were taking this whole propaganda of evil and giving it advocacy and respectability. It is no time for the church to go to sleep. There is a call for good fighting all along the line.

8. For instance, we are going to be compelled, unless there is a great clean-up in the moving picture industry, to insist on a national censorship and a board of supervision over the motion picture industry. One of the greatest business enterprises which has grown in the last decade to marvelous proportions should help America by its lessons of human uplift and not degrade popular thought and character by purveying base and debauching influences. These shows should feature the beautiful, clean home life in America and not simply display the looseness and vileness that winds up in the divorce courts. They should picture some of the great political and business enterprises and not limit themselves to the exploitation of crookedness, immorality, and crime that makes viciousness popular.

9. Then we are in for a great anti-gambling

PAGAN INROADS

crusade and must ultimately shut out from the mails, telegraphs, and interstate service the transportation and sale of race-track betting odds, their ticket issues, and advertisements. We cannot have a great United States and an honorable people if we disintegrate the business integrity of America and permit the spreading of the gambling mania through our nation's mails, over the wires, and by means of other public service. Every business transaction a man engages in advances industry, aids home life, and builds his own integrity. If one goes into a butcher shop and spends \$1.50 for a beefsteak, he thus serves the three parties concerned, but if he goes into a gambling establishment he will do one of two things. He will get something for nothing or nothing for something. If he gets nothing for something, he is a fool; if he gets something for nothing, he is a thief. But he has not been engaged in a business transaction; he has not built up his honor, but he has disintegrated his integrity and character, and there is nothing more insidious than this mania.

I believe that the women of our country have saved our civilization in the past. I have seen men saturated with tobacco, sogged with intoxicants, stained with personal vices, their lips soiled with profanity, and their natures

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

groveling; and have said to myself, "What will become of the next generation with such fathers?" Still, in such homes were pure, hard-working, devoted Christian women, and they had character and pure blood enough to counteract the evil fathers and give to us clean American children with the possibilities of splendid usefulness locked up in their souls. But a generation ago, say when we were children, there came a time when the women misstepped. One can recall the days when the progressive euchre fad swept the women of the land, and there were people that boasted that they had played progressive euchre five afternoons in a week and seven evenings. A study of criminology at first hand in our jails and penitentiaries, shows a large number of men now serving sentences who were always thieves because of maternal inheritance. We must stamp this habit out of our life and this mania out of our civilization if we would have a business integrity that shall maintain American honor among the nations of the earth.

10. We maintain that the protection of the American flag and all consular service must be withdrawn from any citizen of these United States who goes into Mexico, China, Africa, or to any foreign country to engage in a traffic or to set up an institution which has been out-

PAGAN INROADS

lawed by the Constitution and statutes of these United States. Our nation cannot consistently involve itself in international difficulties to protect disloyal citizens of our land in doing that against the weaker people of other nations for which we would imprison them if the offense were committed at home.

11. Americanism is that achievement of national unity as an equipment for world service, which the nation found it needed at the outbreak of the Great War, and which need was just as imperative before we found it out. To this end I would insist on the English language as the exclusive basis for American education in all of our public schools up to the eighth grade, and as the medium of communication through every American published newspaper. If we must have a foreign language press in this country, there should be an American translation in a parallel column for every line in a foreign tongue. We must eliminate these little foreign-language groups segregated from the rest of our people and from the assimilative processes of America, that keep up their Old-World customs, planning disloyalty in peace time and plotting treason in war time. One language would be a unifier among us.

12. The divine right of democracy implies

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

the sovereign right of the people to rule themselves, to make their own government, to write their laws, direct their institutions, and select their officers for executive, judicial, and legislative branches of their own service. We shall, therefore, stand for the direct primary in every State. Through it the people can name the candidates of their own parties, after which the same sovereign people may select between candidates so chosen by their parties after the unfit have been weeded out. We should resist every attempt to side-track the direct primary as an assault upon the rights of the people to choose self-government and to rule. We should stand for it against all comers as the primary right of the individual to eliminate the bosses and to govern his own country. And in view of the efforts of the politicians in the National Conventions of 1920 to defeat the will and choice of the people we should extend the direct primary to every State; and its application to the choice of the Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates, thus making unnecessary the holding of another national nominating convention as long as the republic endures.

13. Popular government machinery demands the initiative, referendum, and the recall for the fullest expression of the people's

PAGAN INROADS

power. When God made man capable of self-government and told him to have dominion, he made kings unnecessary and bosses inexcusable. All the machinery necessary to enable men to start any measure for the statute books or the Constitution, to call for a referendum of the people's judgment on any measure passed by their representatives, or to recall any officer who betrays by his falsity or proves unfit by his weakness to meet the responsibility with which he is intrusted, is necessary for the expression of the people's right to rule their own land, to direct their own public servants, and to discharge the unfit.

14. This is a Christian nation. The supreme court was right when it declared it so and said that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are an integral part of our common law, that the Sabbath is incorporated into the second article of the Constitution, that God is the recognized Sovereign over all, that the Bible is his Word, that the government is his agent for the promotion of morality, religion, brotherhood, and the public welfare, and that these institutions, pillars of support for our civilization, shall stand, and the gates of Bolshevism, the I. W. W., anarchy, and the lawlessness that circumvents the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

and brazenly attempts the Eighteenth Amendment shall not prevail against us. For when these principles prevail, "Violence shall no more be heard within our streets, wasting nor destruction in our borders; but they shall call our walls salvation and our gates praise."

The Church of Christ has a supreme task and a program for its opportunity. By voice and vote, by platform and press, through the sights and sounds of street speeches she will stand for the government, the Constitution, the laws, the flag. She should stand with any party candidate or officer who faithfully executes our laws, fight for him as long as he keeps these standards, and turn against him and his party if they abandon the right and fail to serve the people and their government.

We nail to our masthead no such ignoble sentiment as "My country, right or wrong," but "My country, may she ever be right; but should she go wrong, God give me grace and strength to help set her right."

We do not seek to unite the church with the state, nor to make the church domineer the state, nor to let the state oppress the church, but we will help to see that the church aids the state in maintaining good government, and thus to furnish a fulcrum of uplift for the moral betterment of mankind.

VI

THE FUNCTION OF LAW IN CIVIL GOVERNMENT

HUMAN laws are intended to be applications of the laws of nature to protect natural rights. And, as Blackstone says, "a law that contravenes the law of God or a law of nature is no law at all." The Jewish and Christian Scriptures claim to be expressions of the laws of nature and the will of God; and, if it could be demonstrated that in any material fact they contravene or run counter to nature (which is the certain expression of the will of God), their teaching to that extent would be worthless.

The object of human law is not to enact the laws of nature but to enforce them, furnishing sanctions by putting a penalty to their violation. But their execution is beyond the reach of all created intelligence. All violations of natural laws depend upon two causes, ignorance and *inability*. The first does not necessarily involve moral turpitude, though it finds no excuse in the realm of nature. The second

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

is the result of abuse that produced the inability. With the abuse human law has nothing to do. Nature demands the use of every faculty, settles her own accounts, and never pardons a delinquent. Her jurisdiction extends only to the realm of justice, "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." But while "eye" and "tooth" by abuse lose ability to perform their functions, they cannot escape the demands of nature nor the consequences of their inability to perform such natural functions.

The people of an Eastern city were recently excited at the discovery of a living, newly born infant on a pile of city rubbish, cut and bruised by being cast away. A charitable mother of natural instincts resuscitated and gave it a mother's care. The difference between these two mothers was not that nature had denied the one the natural instincts of a mother and bestowed them upon the other. Even admitting a difference by heredity, that difference can never be traced to a gift of nature, for nature in a purely natural state never makes such distinctions. No gorilla in the jungles of Africa or grizzly bear of the Rocky Mountains would cast off or refuse protection to an offspring, but would defend it at the peril of her own existence.

THE FUNCTION OF LAW

When the infant in question was discovered the offending mother was sought for to be punished, but, to the astonishment of some of the wise jurists, no law could be found in statutes of that State to meet the case; and it might be both interesting and instructive to say that no human legislator ever attempted to legislate on this subject. To command a mother to protect her offspring is a law which finite beings can neither make nor enforce. In vain do we seek to find such a law in the records of antiquity. Neither Solon, Lycurgus, nor Justinian has jurisdiction here. None but the Creator can enact such a law, for the simple reason that no other has power to enforce it. No law but that of love can reach this point; and this can never be produced by statutes, pains, and penalties. No law can compel a mother to take care of her offspring. Compulsion finds no place in moral actions.

When a mother refuses, who can compel, and in what way? God himself would be impotent, as he has but one remedy—to change her nature, and this only by her own consent and cooperation, for “a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.” Where is the remedy? Certainly not in law. If every human mother should refuse to own and care for her offspring,

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

where would be the difficulty and what the remedy? The difficulty would be in the corruption or loss of natural instinct; and the only remedy is its restoration.

It seems startling that the perpetuity of the human race should hang on such a seemingly slender thread as maternal instinct; but no more so than that the whole material fabric of nature should hang on an invisible and incomprehensible force we call gravity. Gravity unifies and upholds the material universe. Love does the same in the moral realm, while faith prompts the obedience of all moral beings. Human authority may prevent an immoral act, but neither human nor divine authority can ever compel an unwilling moral action.

When creative energy had been expended in the formation of the planetary system, had these planets been given volition and free will by a decree of the Creator, their motions and harmony would be no longer under his control. If, in the exercise of their freedom, they should refuse obedience, but one remedy would be left: their destruction. But in the case of man who had offspring, far different.

LAW AND ITS PENALTY

If we look for the ultimate source of all prog-

THE FUNCTION OF LAW

ress, we find it in the above title, "Law and Its Penalty."

Law to the obedient means protection. Penalty to the disobedient begets fear. To all inferior creatures the fear of penalty is the sum total of their wisdom. To man, an intelligent creature, "the fear of the Lord [lawmaker] is the beginning of wisdom." Fear to the whole animal world is the means of protection and progress.

"Law is a rule of action," says Blackstone. This he took from the Hebrew idea of law answering to a line or straight-edge (Hebrew, *Torah*). To verify this, see examples of law in the New Testament. In Paul's controversy with the Jews they contended that law was a rule of justification. Paul contended that the law condemned us. See his analogy: "If there had been a law that could have given life, verily righteousness had been by the law." So if there had been a line that could make the crooked straight, straightness had been by the line." "The law maketh nothing perfect." The line maketh nothing straight.

But, says the psalmist, "The law of the Lord is perfect"; the line of the Lord is straight. Paul says, "The law is tutor *to bring* us unto Christ." The law put upon a bad man's character shows his departure from truth and

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

right. The line put upon a stick of timber shows its bumps and protuberances. To frame a building by a crooked square would destroy the material. To govern mankind by bad or false laws will destroy families and nations. A law that is not founded in the law of nature is not law (Blackstone). A falsehood has no absolute existence and as such must perish. A counterfeit is only a false representation, has no entity. A picture is only the shadow of a substance; a hypocrite is only the false reflection of a true character. A law reflecting false principles manufactures destroying individuals and nations. Law without a penalty is a misnomer; remove penalty from law and it becomes only advice. The whole universe is under the "reign of law," and there is but one law, the law of nature (Blackstone); and all just human laws are only true reflections from it; and all unjust laws are not "bad laws," but are "not laws" (Blackstone); they are only false reflections. No man is bound by the law of God or man that violates a law of nature. "Children," says the apostle, "obey your parents in the Lord," but a parental command is not obligatory on a child when it requires a violation of the law of God.

Law is the only natural educator in the universe. The penalty affixed to and admin-

THE FUNCTION OF LAW

istered by the laws of nature regulates the actions of all creatures below man in the animal kingdom, and keeps every creature in the place nature assigned it. One step taken out of its natural sphere is met by the penalty of violated law, and it either dies or returns to its obedience.

“Said a downy young duck to a fluffy young chick,
‘Come down to the water and swim;
By the best kind of luck the right path I can
pick,
And the horse trough is full to the brim.’

“The chick saw him dive and come up still alive,
And, full of ambition and pride,
At the slip of his toe, he felt himself go,
And fell into the water and died.”

Had that young “chick” made his escape from that “horse trough,” never again would it have gone into water. A dog will never be caught in the same trap the second time, but a man may get drunk, and in that helpless condition get his ears, toes, and fingers frozen off, or meet with some other calamity; and, instead of his learning an effectual lesson (as in the case of all inferior creatures), he is only qualified to repeat the act, as we see by actual observation; and every time the act is repeated, with less resistance, until nothing remains but

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

appetite; and this in Scripture is called fixedness (Luke 16. 26), and "an eternal sin" (Mark 3. 29). It is described in one word, "Lost"—separated from everything but himself, with no regard for anything but himself, out of harmony with himself, with no resources to draw from but himself, and all knowledge of his natural relations forever lost. This is a finished character produced by disobedience to law; and "sin is lawlessness" (1 John 3. 4). Hence "Sin, when it is full grown, bringeth forth death" (James 1. 15).

On this passage Dr. McKnight says, "The soul which the Greek philosophers considered as the seat of the appetites and passions is called by Phila *to thalm*, the female part of our nature, and the spirit *to aggen*, the male part. In allusion to that notion James represents men's lusts as an harlot who entices their understanding and will into its impure embraces, and from that conjunction conceives sin, and sin being brought forth, it immediately acts and is nourished by frequent repetition till at length it gains such strength that in its turn it begets death, which destroys the sinner. This is the true genealogy of sin and death; lust is the mother of sin, and sin the mother of death, and the sinner the parent of both."

THE FUNCTION OF LAW

This idea is as old as Job 28. 22. In speaking of heavenly wisdom he says,

“Destruction and Death [*abbaddon vama-veth*; literally, “the devil and his offspring death”], say

We have heard a rumor thereof with our ears.”

Here Christ is represented as wisdom (*choch-moh*) and the “life” and offspring of God; and “death” the offspring of the devil. See in Rev. 9. 11 the king of the bottomless pit is called Abaddon and Apollyon. Abaddon is his name in Hebrew, and the very word used by Job, and Apollyon is the same in Greek letters. The violation of law produces death, and the devil is the father of lies. The law of nature is the only rule of action that protects, and fear produces obedience to the law. Hence “fear” is the beginning of all wisdom.

Laws in all human governments are designed for *protection* and *education*, and they accomplish their purposes only as they are obeyed or enforced. When no law is made no penalty can exist, and where there is no penalty there is no fear, and when there is no “fear” education has failed of results.

While there is but one kingdom of nature, there are three kingdoms in nature: mineral,

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

vegetable, and animal. A stone lives in but one, the mineral; a tree in two, the mineral and the vegetable; a man in all three. Each of these kingdoms has its own immutable laws, strictly administered in its own department. Death is the penalty of transgression in all. And death has been defined by Herbert Spencer, "to be out of harmony with environment." A tree lives in two kingdoms, its root in the mineral and its stock and branches in the vegetable. Out of harmony with either kingdom means death to the whole tree. It can die through its roots or through its trunk. Out of harmony with either environment destroys root and branches. A man lives in all three kingdoms, and is circumscribed by the laws of each; and if out of harmony with either, the whole man dies. Either kingdom had power to serve him; but if the forces of either turn against him, he is ruined.

Now, apply these scriptural principles to the temperance question! There is no law against drunkenness; and, as there is no penalty, no man is afraid to get drunk. He is recognized and protected as one of the social compact and cannot be restrained until he performs an overt act by becoming disorderly, disturbing the public peace, or becoming a menace to public safety. As there is no law

THE FUNCTION OF LAW

against drunkenness a man commits no crime when he gets drunk and destroys his capability for self-government; he is still a member of society, is protected, and cannot be restrained. Society must chance the danger and stand the consequences, take all the risks for the destruction of life and property, and protect the man in what is termed a self-responsible condition. This may be right under moral law; but under social law it logically will demolish the whole social fabric.

Why not allow a man to build a combustible shanty on a corner lot of a densely populated city, and make society take the risk of future danger? That shanty might stand for years before it takes fire, causing the destruction of life and property! Why not wait till the danger develops into results? Why not allow a man to trot a horse or run an automobile a mile in two minutes through the streets of a populous city? Simply for the reason, that, while in society, he must be made to obey the social law. Otherwise he should be put out of society.

It might be asked if this be so, have not the temperance people under this rule a right to refuse to pay taxes incurred by inconsistent legislation? Not if the law was the fairly expressed will of society. In such a case it

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

would be the duty of temperance people to obey the law or (like the Pilgrim Fathers) leave the social compact. A refusal to obey such a law would not be a crime against nature, nor a violation of natural law, but it would be a crime against society, as resistance would engender greater evils and prevent moral reform. Resistance would change the field of contest, array the majority against the minority, and moral reform would come to an end by arraying against it a superior force, taking it out of its own sphere of action.

The "survival of the fittest" is the continuance of that which fits the environments. A moral reform can never succeed against superior numbers; and in a political or physical contest nothing but moral forces can promote moral reform; and, when it gains a firm control over the moral sentiment of a people, it crystallizes in the form of law. It is then out of the hands of the moral reformer.

In the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to our Constitution we see the struggles of a moral reform with a pagan institution; in the Eighteenth Amendment are crystallized the results of two thousand years' contest with another; and the laws of the whole Christian world but record the struggles of Christianity with pagan institutions. No pagan nations

THE FUNCTION OF LAW

make any such history or show any such progress. Moral reformers are always in the minority, and moral force is their only weapon. When anything is substituted for this, the moral reformer abandons his post and moral reform is at an end.

THE UNWRITTEN LAW

Lord Coke once said, "The reason of the law is the life of the law; and, if a man know law and know not the reason thereof, he will soon forget his superficial knowledge." This means that a knowledge of the fundamental principle and purpose of law is a safer guide than the committing of specific enactments.

This harmonizes with Paul's great statement that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." The purpose of law is to preserve order and protect human rights of life, property, fame, and family. Whatever subverts this principle is unlawful. Whatever helps it is in harmony with the principle of law.

Accordingly, Blackstone affirms, "If a judge is sworn to administer a specific law, and it can be shown that that law contravenes the law of God or the law of nature, his oath binds him to set aside this law, not on the ground that it is bad law, but on the ground that it is not law; for if the object of the lawmaker was

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

to confine his law to the law of God, if he made a mistake, it is only like a clerical mistake, so that in setting aside his law, the judge carries out his intention."

It is perfectly in harmony with this statement that in all civilized nations and through all past time a man has been regarded as the natural protector of his home, his wife, his sister, and his daughter. It has, therefore, been recognized that when the good name of either was at stake, it was not unmanly for the natural protector to defend her, if necessary, with his life; and it speaks well for American manhood that a jury cannot be found that will convict a man of murder who thus defends his own household.

This unwritten law as thus defined, instead of being a retrograde movement, is strongest in the most highly civilized. The statutes covering criminal jurisprudence are all man-made; and even our constitutions were each made by delegated bodies of men; but the unwritten law is the law of nature, and, therefore, the law of God. Any laws or sentiments in conflict with it must be lower laws, for there can be none higher.

When Jesus said, "If the master of the house had known in what hour the thief was coming, . . . he would . . . not have left his house to

THE FUNCTION OF LAW

be broken through," he was giving expression to the universally recognized truth that when a house is attacked a man does not have to call an officer but is himself the natural protector of his own domicile. Civilization has accepted this idea of Jesus as a fundamental, legal axiom, but it has a wider significance than men are accustomed to give it. The law of self-defense is universally recognized; and the Saviour quoted with approval Adam's reference to his wife, "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: . . . Therefore, shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his own wife" (Gen. 2. 23). One has the same right to protect his wife as himself.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

One of the most notorious defects in our civilization is the utter inadequacy of our criminal law and its administration to prevent murder. We have in single States more murders annually than in all of Great Britain. Our laws are so loose that a shrewd criminal with money can slip through, and the administration is so lax that hardly anyone criminally inclined is afraid of the law. One murderer gets more modern sympathy than all the murder victims in the State combined.

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

Yet with crimes increasing and murder abounding, we find this modern sentiment organizing against capital punishment even for rape and murder.

A judge, now deceased, who for thirty years administered the law in the Courts of Common Pleas, once remarked when the subject of punishment for crime was under discussion, "The taking of life after due process of the law as penalty for murder seems to be the only form of life-taking to which the average American has an objection." The same judge once declared, to the shocked sensibilities of certain practitioners and their clients in the old quarter sessions, that drunkenness could not be pleaded before him in extenuation of the crime of murder; that to his mind it was an aggravation of the offense.

Recently a governor, in declining to interfere in the cases of two culprits for whom drunkenness was advanced as an excuse, had the courage and good sense to decline to interfere on any such grounds. "I may say that in view of the disregard of human life which some elements of our population continually exhibit, I do not think that our criminal law for the punishment of murder in the first degree should be relaxed."

Of course the emotional propaganda that

THE FUNCTION OF LAW

proposes to change our fundamental law by the elimination of capital punishment will always try to quote the Bible. Wherein does their fallacy lie? Where all fallacies lie—in a conclusion drawn from a statement of fact; false conclusions drawn from the facts of nature are the source of all false views of nature, and erroneous conclusions drawn from statements of revelation form the basis of all religious error.

Science is from *scio* ("to know") and the history of its teaching and progress would be a revelation of exploded ideas, human thoughts perverting true lessons of nature's facts. All progression is based on ignorance. Where there is no ignorance there is no room for progression.

The Legislature of Michigan abolished capital punishment from a conclusion drawn from the Bible statement that God protected Cain after the murder of his brother Abel. "And Jehovah appointed a sign for Cain, lest any finding him should smite him." From this statement they conclude that God was opposed to capital punishment. But after an incalculable amount of evil, and the sacrifice of many innocent lives, the conclusion was seen to be a false inference. No civil government was then in existence where life could be taken by a

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

process of law, and individual retribution or mob violence was what was forbidden. This was clearly expressed, "lest anyone finding him should smite him." But as soon as government was established and a law published the criminal was turned over to legal authority and the mandate issued, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."

Have the criminals who do outrageous things any rights which can overbalance the natural instincts of manhood? The apostle to the Gentiles says: "They that practice such things are worthy of death" (Rom. 1. 32).

A study of the thirteenth chapter of Romans, where the purpose of law is shown to be "a terror to evildoers and a praise to them that do well," and the administrator of law is made "an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil," will show the basis for civil government and indicate its right to take even life for the public good.

We think a careful investigation will show that wherever the death penalty for murder is relaxed murders will multiply. In our temperance campaigns embarrassing statistics have been presented to the "Drys" about the number of murders in Kansas over Nebraska, a wet State. There was only one reason that there were more murders in the dry State than

THE FUNCTION OF LAW

in the wet, and that was that there was no death penalty for any crime in Kansas; and its penitentiaries are populated with murderers, who came across the State lines to commit their deed, and waited their opportunity to entice their victims where it would be safe to kill them, and where for such deeds they were boarded at public expense in as palatial quarters as they ever expected to live in, with a guarantee of it for the balance of their life, and a possibility that a governor could pardon them out at any time. Imprisonment has never been a sufficiently strong deterrent to keep men from committing rape or murder.

VII

THE LATEST EVOLUTION OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

THE State of Oregon was founded by missionaries. It was built on the foundation of the Bible and church, schools and homes. Its pioneers labored for the glory of God and the weal of man. It has collected and grown a population of the most progressive thinkers and independent actors to be found under our flag. It has more colleges in proportion to its population than any other State. It is a land of churches, schools, homes, and modern systems of government. I believe it is building the purest civilization with the highest moral standards and the freest popular government of any State in the Union or country of the world. The Australian ballot system was tried out there and passed on to the other States. The direct primary nominations were inaugurated in Oregon and have since been adopted elsewhere. The anomaly of allowing United States senators to be elected for the people by proxy was wiped off the map in Oregon and

THE LATEST EVOLUTION

a direct method of permitting the people to select their own senators was tried out, made good, and finally was embodied in the federal Constitution, so that every State in the Union could follow Oregon's lead.

There came a period of corruption and political chicanery. Oregon representatives no longer stood for the ideals of the people and outraged their moral sentiment with impunity. Conspiracies to rob the government were rife, and land fraud cases going unrebuked created no comment. But the people secured the direct primary, adopted the initiative, referendum, and recall, so that they could select their own leaders, write their own laws, repeal those that did not suit them, rewrite those that ought to be changed, and call back from office those whom they had trusted and who had proved unworthy.

Some years ago I lectured on this subject before the Illinois Bar Association and was justifying the recall of judges on any needed occasion when an Illinois judge inquired: "How many judges have you ever recalled in Oregon?"

I replied, "Not one."

"Then why all this to-do about it?"

I said, "You may have the recall through generations and never need to use it, but the

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

States that do not have it need it all the time. It is like the Texan's pistol. The minister, arguing with him that he should not carry a revolver, said, 'How long have you carried it?'

" 'Ten years.'

" 'Have you ever needed to use it?'

" 'No,' he replied. 'A man may carry one of these things a lifetime and never need it, but if it's ever called for, he needs it bad.' "

The more I travel over other States the more justification I see of the Oregon system of government. We have the best State government and the best governed cities, with the freest expression of the popular will and the highest type of Christian civilization to be found under our flag. Most of the moral reforms that have been adopted—wiping off the stain of our political corruption, open gambling, lewdness and looseness, closing the saloons on Sunday, then at midnight, then prohibiting the liquor traffic day and night forever—have come about not through legislative enactments, nor through the help of professional politicians, but have come to pass through the initiation by the people themselves, or by a referendum to the people, or by putting the fear of God upon the politicians through the recall.

A list of the bad measures rejected by the

THE LATEST EVOLUTION

people and another list of the good laws accepted since we have possessed the paraphernalia for popular government, would be the most powerful argument for this method of legislation. More beneficent laws were passed in Oregon in the first ten years of the people's reign than in the entire previous history of the State.

Every defect that has developed in our democracy can be cured better by more democracy than by less. The same old struggle that began on the dark vortex of history is on in the United States to-day. In our republic it is not the petty tyrant or the hereditary sovereign but the wily politician who tries to thwart the will of the people. And the upward trend in America is the downing of the political boss and the uprising for the people's rights. Our patriotic fathers adopted the right principle and wrote it into their Constitutions, but it was new to them; and when they came to apply it they hedged a little. They said, "The people can be trusted to elect all but the Presidents and the United States senators. These are so important that the people might make a mistake. We will let them elect electors who, acting for them, shall select a fit man for President." So we have inherited our cumbrous system of Presidential

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

elections from the fearful timidity of our forefathers. The Constitution provided that the people might elect the lower House of Congress but the senators should be elected in the several State legislatures.

It is interesting that the only two big blunders made by the founders of our nation were the two that limited the people's power in self-government. The first one has been corrected by common consent through the custom of practically instructing the Presidential electors and they dare not ignore that instruction.

Then Oregon led the States in taking the election of senators out of the political rings that too long had controlled, and permitting the sovereign people to say who should represent them in the highest branch of the government. They passed a law in Oregon that any candidate for the Legislature must sign one of three statements. Statement number one: "I will always vote for that candidate for United States senator who shall have received the largest number of votes in the primary election preceding." Statement number two: "I will vote for that candidate who shall receive the highest number of votes within my party." Statement number three: "I decline to say beforehand for whom I will vote for senator." Of course we never elected anyone

THE LATEST EVOLUTION

who signed the third plank, and only a few who signed the second. The people believed in the first proposition. They selected four United States senators before the government passed the federal amendment electing United States senators by popular votes, and they never allowed the hands of the political boss to touch their ark of the covenant—the integrity of popular government. I saw a Republican Legislature with practical unanimity elect George E. Chamberlain, the Democratic candidate, because the people had made him their choice. This has been criticized, but more generally commended, for the people cannot be said to rule unless they can select from either party the man they want. Party machine or no machine, the people of America have set their hand to the task of asserting the people's choice in selecting officers and writing laws and to deal with the men who dare to sell them out or to betray their trusts.

When the people had selected George E. Chamberlain, a Democrat, but elected an overwhelmingly Republican Legislature, there followed one of the shrewdest plays ever made to get honorable men to betray their trust. The old-line politicians proposed to get up a petition to be signed by Republican voters offering to exempt these elected representatives

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

of the people from fulfilling their promise in view of the fact that the unexpected had happened and the people had chosen a Democrat.

I was at that time pastor of a prominent Methodist church in Portland, and as bearing on our fight for the people's right to rule, I delivered an address which was printed in seventy newspapers and sent in popular form to every member-elect in the Oregon Legislature. It did its share in the making of history for popular rights. It was entitled, "That Petition for Perjury."

It recalls some matters of history. In 1824 there were four Presidential candidates—William H. Crawford, Andrew Jackson, Henry Clay, and John Quincy Adams. Jackson received the vast majority of the popular vote and a majority of the electoral vote, but not having a constitutional majority over all the candidates, there was no election and the selection was thrown into Congress. Clay, who had received the smallest number of votes, withdrew and threw his influence for Adams, and Crawford's following went to Adams, so by this combination the people's choice was defeated. Adams made Clay his secretary of state as a reward, but the people later repudiated the whole scheme, defeated nearly every representative who had betrayed them,

THE LATEST EVOLUTION

and in four years afterward triumphantly elected Andrew Jackson as the people's choice by a larger proportional majority than any other candidate has received save Lincoln on his second term.

Another lesson from history. In the campaign of 1876 James Russell Lowell was elected Presidential elector from Massachusetts. He was a Republican and was for Hayes. But before the meeting of the electoral college Lowell became convinced that Tilden was elected by the people, and contemplated casting his electoral vote for him. He finally decided that it was not his vote to cast, but right or wrong, it belonged to the people who elected him, and therefore he must cast that vote as they expected him to and as their votes had instructed him.

Jackson's famous slogan, "Shall the People Rule?" is always the supreme issue; and, when the House of Representatives made bold to trample the will of the people under foot the people repudiated their act. The Congress had a constitutional right to do it, but no moral right; and we protested that our Legislature had no moral right to elect any other than the people's choice for our senator. We went down to the Oregon Legislature to see the results, and if there had been a man in our Legis-

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

lature who tried to use his vote in the old way for party purpose or for a machine candidate, we would have stopped him and said: "Stop, sir. That vote in your hand is not yours to give. It belongs to the people of this State, and they told you for whom they wish it cast. We protest against your intention and deny your moral right to bestow it against the people's will. We know the voice we hear pleading for a strict party vote is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

At this period Theodore Roosevelt met George E. Chamberlain, the Democratic choice of the people, and the great President said: "I am glad to see you, Governor Chamberlain, and senator-to-be. I would have preferred to have a Republican come from Oregon, but I stand for the right of the people to rule; and therefore I want to see you elected senator." What a contrast is this sentiment from that of the small politicians who were trying to scheme out some plot to defeat the people's will!

I was present in the Capitol at Salem on that day, making the opening prayer at the joint session of the Legislature. I heard the roll called, and every man in both Houses who had taken statement number one pledge, stood up and voted for the people's choice regardless

THE LATEST EVOLUTION

of party politics. Every man of them stood with the people and voted as they were instructed. It is safe to go up or down with the people of this country. They will be here doing business at the old stand when the corruptionists who seek to entice them to betray their trusts, only to forsake them in their weakness and folly and shame, are all forgotten. It is a great tribute we pay to the average morality and loyalty of Oregon men when we state this fact. For loyalty to principle is higher than loyalty to party. The first is founded upon the eternal verities of nature and nature's God, the second upon the shifting sands of political policies. Far above any flickering light or battle lantern of party is the Everlasting Sun of Righteousness in whose beauties are the duties of men.

THE MODERN MAGNA CHARTA

It is significant that in a far Western State there should have been evolved the outstanding characteristics of the best system of popular government known. First the Australian ballot system was adopted to secure honesty in elections. An effective registration law followed, which guards the integrity of the privilege of American citizenship—participation in government. Then came the direct primary,

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

which absolutely insures popular selection of all candidates, and establishes the responsibility of the public servant to the electorate, and not to any political boss or special interest or convention. Plainly stated, the aim and purpose of these laws was to destroy the irresponsible political machine and to put all elective officers in the State in direct touch with the people as the real source of authority; to give full force to the ballot of every individual elector, and to eliminate dominance of corporate and corrupt influences in the administration of public affairs. The Oregon laws marked the course that must be pursued before the wrongful use of corporate power can be dethroned, the people restored to power, and lasting reform secured. They insure absolute government by the people.

In all this modern movement to put the power of government back in the hands of the people Oregon has been a leader. Her initiative and referendum became the keystone of the arch of popular government. Under it, if a certain percentage of the voters—say ten per cent—sign a petition for a law, and file it with the proper officials, the law is published by the State in a State book of measures and mailed as a State campaign document. In it arguments on both sides of each proposition

THE LATEST EVOLUTION

may be presented by the individual or committee responsible for bringing up the measure and by the one who would be affected should the measure pass. This book is mailed by the State to every registered voter and becomes the political Bible of the Oregonian for the campaign months; and though I have known the State to vote on thirty-two measures at one election, the average man could discuss every one, giving the pros and cons of the arguments with the ease of a practiced lawyer. The educational value of this experiment in government is limitless.

The initiative is defined as the giving of the people the right to propose legislation which is to be acted upon, properly designated on the official ballot. Every measure is voted upon by "Yes" or "No." A majority of one "Yes" makes it the people's law.

The referendum is the method of referring all legislation to the people for their final acceptance or rejection. As generally advocated it requires that no law save a strictly defined class of urgent measures for the public peace, health, and safety, which usually must have a two-thirds majority to pass, shall go into effect without waiting a fixed time, say ninety days. If during this time a part of the voters—say ten per cent—sign a petition for a refer-

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

endum on that law it will not go into effect until the next regular election, when the people vote on it, and if a majority vote "No," it is as though never enacted.

The referendum measures are divided into optional referendum referred on the basis of a petition for it, or compulsory referendum, where the law requires that legislation of that subject matter be referred to the people with or without their petition.

The initiative and the referendum provided for what is known as direct legislation by the people rather than indirect or legislation through representatives, and in some States the people have taken over so much of the power of making and unmaking laws, electing and recalling officers, that the phrase popular versus representative government has come to be a standard of measurement.

The next great forward step in restoring to the people the rights of self-government was the adoption of a Corrupt Practices Act, which prevents any abuse under the initiative and referendum, direct primary or the recall. It was such a provision recently invoked in Minnesota, where a candidate ran in the primary against A. J. Volstead, author of our prohibition law. He made a campaign against him, asserting that he was an atheist, and unfor-

THE LATEST EVOLUTION

tunately won the Republican primary on that false charge. But there is a provision that if any man secures for himself a nomination or election to a position of emolument or honor on a false charge against his opponent, the courts shall set the election aside. Mr. Volstead came into the court and proved that he was a Christian, a church member, and frequently made addresses in the churches around Washington, and the result of the primary was set aside. Volstead was nominated by his party and triumphantly reelected.

The recall is a plan by which the people, having trusted any man with one of their offices, can upon learning that he has been unfaithful in the discharge of duty, has been corrupt, or drunk, or treacherous, or unmindful of the people, be removed by them as easily as he was elected by them; the theory being that any power that has the right to employ for its own service ought to have the right to discharge for a failure to render the service.

The sensitiveness which has been displayed in the mortal dread of what is known as the recall applied to judges, has never in America experienced a single fact to justify it. There is no logical reason why the courts should not be within the power of the sovereign people as well as their executive and legislative depart-

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

ments. What is there about judges that makes them so sacred that the people who elected them and pay them and submit to their decisions should not discharge them if they betray the people's trust? They are all lawyers! Oregon has had this system for fifteen years and has never proposed to use it upon one judge, but that does not prove that the system is not needed. It is an admonitory or precautionary measure the existence of which prevents the necessity for its use. But it is an essential feature of the complete system of popular government and puts the fear of God upon those who are no sooner in office than they adopt the creed of a certain Tammany leader, "The public be damned."

These reforms are essential to adapt a government to modern civilization and should be adopted quickly by the States, that our laws may conform to our present needs as the bark of a growing tree expands with the swelling trunk. Any reform which brings the government nearer the heart of the people and the convictions of the people to bear directly upon legislation and law enforcement is not only good American doctrine, but it is divine doctrine, for it is in harmony with Him who said, "Let us make man in our image, . . . and let them have dominion."

THE LATEST EVOLUTION

Those States that have adopted all this paraphernalia of popular government have been the first to secure the commission plan for their cities, with amazingly good results in almost every place. Under the old system with a city council of politicians having no sense of responsibility to their own constituents, our government became so corrupt that in a thousand cities the council was the sore spot of the place. The old order has been superseded by the Galveston plan of electing a mayor who supervises the business and the executive work of the city and placing a responsible head, not to represent each ward, but to represent the city as a whole in the management of a given department for which he is held responsible. This more nearly resembles the President's Cabinet, making each man the head of a department, locating responsibility and eliminating that collective body of irresponsible politicians we used to call the city council.

THE COMMON PEOPLE TO THE RESCUE

The present representative system is weak in both theory and practice. It interposes an easily corrupted Legislature between the people and their law and likewise places a political party, no less easily corrupted, and made up in its managing members of those who de-

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

pend upon their party connections for daily bread, and consequently hold their honor and their loyalty to the people cheaper than the price daily offered by the monopolist and the saloonist. The good citizen, on the contrary, can exercise little influence in politics or government, his activities being engrossed in the business of making a living.

The initiative and referendum, however, is no longer an experiment. The people have shown themselves qualified to elect and legislate for themselves. They have passed upon thirty-eight charter amendments in one city at one time with a discrimination that would have been a credit to any legislative body that ever assembled in that State. Their intelligence and honesty have been brought directly to bear upon the machine of government by the new system. The collective citizen holds no caucus, feels the lash of no party whip, fears no monopoly. He is free to vote his best conviction without fear or favor and is less influenced by party prejudice than ever before. The recall puts us in close touch with our public servants. They are within commanding distance and subject to discharge for disobedience. If we are going to direct the job, we want to be able to reach our employee.

The people enjoy the direct exercise of their

THE LATEST EVOLUTION

sovereignty. They have power; they can get things done; effort is worth while. The system is a great educator and infuses the average citizen with courage and interest in public affairs. The farmer or fisherman out in my State can discuss law and politics with you and keep you busy. They study every measure and the arguments for and against. They can get honest legislation, for there is no infidelity in the collective citizen body, and its judgments are sound and its collective honesty complete. It has sober sense, rational mental processes, and its purposes are exalted. The whole trend of legislation by the electorate is social, economic, progressive, and reformatory, while the tendency of their legislature is to be machine controlled, self-centered, and corrupt. Wherever the people have been given the means of control in lieu of proxy government the State has been purified, and laws that have been needed for a thousand years and never could be passed anywhere were passed the first time they were proposed in Oregon. For instance, civil suits are settled by a three-fourths jury vote, which is just as safe and saves the taxpayers' money on new trials. The many are wiser than any one. Everybody knows more than anybody.

One inherent and peculiar merit of the sys-

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

tem is that if the policy is adopted and proves unsuccessful, the initiative, referendum, and recall can be repealed under their own provisions, thus providing an easy and certain remedy by which the entire law or any of its provisions can be modified or eliminated altogether.

Laws proposed under the initiative are not subject to amendment and therefore must be carefully drawn to stand the scrutiny of the entire State for a four months' campaign. If errors or jokers are discovered, they are invariably voted down. Legislative blackmail and grants of special privilege are made impossible by the referendum. People act with care and caution and with that spirit of fairness that characterizes the man who earns his living and acquires his property by legitimate means.

As a voting citizen of Oregon for sixteen years I look back over the course of the common people's supremacy with absolute admiration. They have elected many United States senators, first weeding out the unfit and unworthy, nominating the best men that ever ran for office, men infinitely better than the convention system ever produced. They have elected thousands of city, county, and municipal officers, and our State was never so well

THE LATEST EVOLUTION

represented in the personnel of its public men as in these years. They have passed upon literally hundreds of measures, and if they have erred, blundered, or failed to discriminate, I am unable to cite the instance. Of course they differed from me sometimes, but they knew what they wanted and why.

I recall one instance of surprise. It was in 1908. The lower river men had gotten up a bill to restrict the fishermen on the Upper Columbia. The Upper Columbia men retaliated by preparing a complicated bill designed to prohibit fishing at the mouth of the river. I had studied all the measures but these two. Standing in the voting booth, this meditation came: "I don't understand the relative merits of these two bills; each crowd is trying to restrict the other. They seem to agree on the principle of restriction. I will vote for both bills." Imagine my surprise when I found that fifty thousand other voters were as sharp as I was, and had overwhelmingly carried both bills and given the fish a rest!

In 1910 the people thought they could use the State initiative to get through county divisions. Nine such bills were presented. The people resented this dragging of local matters into a State contest and voted every one down by a vote of from ten or twenty to one. The

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

conservatism of the electorate is proven by the fact that of the thirty-two measures presented on the ballot in 1910 just nine were adopted, while the general interest of the people in the measures is shown by the fact that an average of seventy-five per cent of the qualified voters acted on them. There has never been general dissatisfaction as a result of a vote. The plan has been found inexpensive. You could put one hundred measures on the ballot and educate the people in the State on all the measures cheaper than you could maintain a Legislature in existence until they were thrashed out.

Then it has corrected so many old abuses. Our Legislature once rejected a corporation franchise tax law, but the people at once had power to pass it by the referendum. The Legislature rejected a direct primary law, but the people at once adopted it by a vote of more than three and a half to one. The Legislature rejected a corrupt practices act, but the people adopted it overwhelmingly. I recall that the Home Telephone System wanted to come into Portland, and because of the poor service and insolence of the old monopoly the folks desired it, but the old corporation made its signs to the city council and a charter for the new company was refused. By the following election the people had the initiative and they gave a

THE LATEST EVOLUTION

charter to the new company by a vote of sixteen to one, which proportion may recall sacred memories to some. The knowledge that the electorate can take a given matter into its hands if the Legislature is recreant has proven the best corrective of the abuses that have sprung up in representative government.

Think of States like Pennsylvania and New Jersey, where up to the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment, the sovereign people did not have the poor privilege of voting "Yes" or "No" on local option for their county, or prohibition for their State.

Amid the complexities of modern civilization the people have no time for that eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty under the old system, where you must go to caucus and watch the game with sleepless vigilance, and then be thwarted by the men who have nothing else to do but scheme out politics. Give us a government where the average man can exert a direct control on nominations in the primaries and in the elections upon the selection of officers, and the making of laws, and then the people rule.

Let us not stay or hinder popular government on its road to the throne of power, but aid to our utmost that evolution in our system

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

which links every department—legislative, judicial, and executive—indissolubly with the power that is responsible for it, the people themselves. In the complicated needs and perplexities of our time every State in our Union ought to have the whole Oregon system of reforms, “that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANY years ago I was thrown into intimate contact with that philosopher and great original expositor of Scriptures, the Rev. I. D. Driver, pioneer in the Oregon country. He called my attention in many conversations to the parallel between the Hebrew commonwealth and our own nation. I owe the seed thought which has developed into the first chapter of this book to his initiative and information, and eighteen years of subsequent investigation has confirmed me in the belief in that parallel which he pointed out.

(Works read or consulted in the preparation of this volume)

United States Constitutional History and Law.

Albert H. Putney, 1908.

Sources of the Constitution of the United States.

C. E. Stevens.

The Growth of the Constitution. William H.

Meigs.

The Origin of Republican Forms of Government.

Oscar S. Straus.

The American People: Planting of a Nation. A.

Maurice Lowe.

The American People: The Harvesting of a Na-

tion. A. Maurice Lowe.

A Treatise on American Citizenship. John S.

Wise, 1906.

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

Legal Maxims and Commentary on the Law.
Broom.

The Evolution of the Law: A Historical Review.
Henry W. Scott.

A History of the Development of the Law. M. F.
Morris.

The Puritan in Holland, England, and America.
Douglas Campbell.

Leading Cases Simplified. (Criminal Law, Common Law, Equity.) 3 vols. John D. Lawson.

Criminal Law. (Contracts, Non-Contracts, Marriage, and Divorce.) 2 vols. Bishop.

Principles of the American Law. 2 vols. William
Raimond Baird.

International Law. I. D. Woolsey.

Principles of the Constitution: Constitutional Limitations. Thomas M. Cooley.

Biblical Lectures. I. D. Driver.

The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible.
Theodore Gerald Soares.

Sociological Study of the Bible. Louis Wallis.

Constitutional and Parliamentary History of the Methodist Episcopal Church. James M. Buckley.

Ecclesiastical Law. Revised Edition. Henry and
Harris.

Digest of Methodist Law. Bishop Stephen M.
Merrill. Revised by David G. Downey.

A Guide in the Administration of the Discipline.
Osmon C. Baker.

Judicial Decisions of the General Conference. R.
J. Cooke.

Law of Evidence. Sir James FitzJames Stephen.

The Law of Evidence. 2 vols. W. N. Best.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Practical Christian Sociology.* Wilbur F. Crafts.
Digest of Evidence. T. W. Hughes.
The Law of Evidence. 2 vols. Simon Greenleaf.
A Dictionary of Law, Judicial Decisions and Explanations. William C. Anderson.
American Democracy Versus Prussian Marxism. Clarence F. Birdseye.
Steps in the Development of American Democracy. Andrew Cunningham McLaughlin.
An Abridgment of Kent's Commentaries of American Law. Eben Francis Thompson.
The American Spirit. Oscar S. Straus.
The Science of Power. Benjamin Kidd.
Have Faith in Massachusetts. Calvin Coolidge.
Americanism Versus Bolshevism. Ole Hanson.
Democracy and the Church. Samuel George Smith.
Fear God and Take Your Own Part. Theodore Roosevelt.
The Battle of Principles. Newell Dwight Hillis.
Social Welfare and the Liquor Traffic. Harry S. Warner.
The Star of the West. Polemus Hamilton Swift.
Supremacy of Law. Bishop John P. Newman.
The Control of the Drink Traffic. (England.) Henry Carter.
Cyclopedia of Temperance, Prohibition, and Public Morals. Deets Pickett, Editor.
The Problem of Gambling. E. Benson Perkins.
The United States A Christian Nation. David J. Brewer.
Christianity and the United States. John F. Goucher.

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

The Power of Ideal in American History.

Ephraim Douglas Adams.

America in the Making. Lyman Abbott.

Conditions of Progress in Democratic Government. Charles H. Hughes.

Four Aspects of Civil Duty. William Howard Taft.

Moral Law and Civil Law. Eli F. Ritter.

The Legalized Outlaw. Samuel R. Artman.

The Logic of Prohibition. Matthew S. Hughes.

Sunday the True Sabbath of God. Sewall Walter Gamble.

Our Military History. Leonard Wood.

The Book of Freeman. Julius F. Seebach.

My Neighbor the Working Man. James R. Day.

The Peace Negotiations. Robert Lansing.

$$\begin{array}{r}
 240 \\
 \hline
 140 \\
 9600 \\
 240 \\
 \hline
 33600
 \end{array}$$

11271

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 669 807 0

